DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

13-14 GEORGE V, 1923

IN FIVE VOLUMES

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

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

Volume V: Pages 4007-4756

VOLUME CLIX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JUNE TO THE THIRTIETH DAY OF JUNE, 1923, INCLUSIVE.



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

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Monday, June 18, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Fifth Report of the Special Committee appointed to inquire into Agricultural conditions —Mr. McMaster.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford) moved:

That the First and Final Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament, appointed to consider:—

1. The forms of Bills and the best means of affording information and assistance in the consideration thereof at all stages of legislation in both Houses of Parliament;

2. The better distribution of the work of legislation between the two Houses;

3. The practical operation of the provisions of The Senate and House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter ten, respecting the attendance of Senators and Members of the House of Commons, and the expediency of making any alterations in those provisions,—which said report was presented to the House of Commons on Thursday, June 14th, 1923, be now concurred in.

He said: Before the motion is put to the House, I should like to say a very few words concerning the report which was presented on Thursday last as the unanimous finding of the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament concerning the matters which were referred to us. Let me say at the outset that this report is nothing more than a recommendation to parliament and to the government concerning the matters therein mentioned and that any action which the House may take to-day will be merely a direction to the government, and will have no effect in changing the law as it now stands upon our statutes until it is implemented by legislation introduced by the government.

The first matter referred to the committee was the form of bills and the best means of affording information and assistance in the consideration thereof at all stages of legislation in both Houses of parliament. I do not desire to take up much time in my remarks on this subject, because the report is very complete and any hon. member reading it in the Votes and Proceedings of Thursday last will see that the committee recommends that when an opportunity presents itself, the rules of the House of Commons be amended for the purpose of altering the form in which bills are now printed for presentation to the House. At the present time, bills merely show enactments and amendments which it is proposed to have approved by parliament, and there is no explanation whatever of the changes which are made in amending acts. The committee unanimously considered that, if it were possible to print on the opposite pages of the bill, the full section or subsection which it is desired to amend, showing in brackets or in italics the changes to be made, and also to print in a parallel column the section or subsection as amended, it would be a great time-saver and would avoid the necessity of many members asking the minister in charge of the bill: What is the present form of the section?—What is the nature of the change?—Why is the change being made? —and a great many questions which are very essential to a proper understanding of the bill, but which could be dispensed with if all this information were included in the bill when it was presented to the House. However, this is merely a recommendation. The rules of the House of Commons, as we all know, are made by the House itself, and it was not thought by the committee that the rules should be amended at this late stage of the session, but it was hoped that our recommendation might be given consideration and that the rules might be amended at the opening of the next session of parliament.

The second matter referred to us was the better distribution of the work of legislation between the two Houses of Parliament. There was a long discussion concerning this matter in committee, and while some members thought that rigid rules should be enacted to the effect that all private legislation should be divided equally between both Houses, it was pointed out by the majority of the committee that this might work a hardship upon senators and members of the House of Commons who might be requested by

their constituents to take charge of a bill at the time of its introduction, and to see that it was safely piloted through its initial stages in that house in which the hon. member occupied a seat. For that reason, in order not to deprive any member of parliament or any senator of the right of introducing a bill which might be specially confided to his care, it was decided merely to recommend that the distribution of all Private Bills be regulated by the Speakers of both Houses jointly, so that as far as practicable, all private legislation should be divided equally between the Senate and the House of Commons. The hon. members of the Senate who were members of this committee seem to be very anxious to do their share of work. They claim that during the opening weeks of the session they are often obliged to adjourn the Senate while waiting for legislation from this Chamber, and that if private legislation was introduced equally in both Houses—with the exception of divorce bills, which of course must be introduced in the other House—the time of parliament could be saved and that many days which are now devoted to private bills by the committees of this House could be better devoted to such government legislation as is sometimes referred to special committees.

The third, and perhaps the most important natter which was referred to the committee, is the practical operation of the provisions of the Senate and House of Commons Act 1906, respecting the attendance of senators and members of the House of Commons, and the expediency of amending these provisions. Let me say at once in this connection that I would not have considered it necessary to make any reference to the report had it not been for certain statements and editorial articles published in the press on Friday and Saturday of last week intimating that it was the desire of the committee to make it easier for senators and members of parliament to earn their sessional indemnities. This idea was far from our minds, and our only desire was to correct certain inconsistencies and anomalies existing in the present act. It will be found that section 32 of the amended act provides that

> For every session of parliament which extends beyond fifty days there shall be payable to each member of the Senate and the House of Commons attending at such session a sessional allowance of $4,000 and no more.

Section 38 provides:

> That in each session of parliament of less than fifty days there shall be allowed to each member of the Senate and House of Commons attending at such session $25 for each day's attendance.

This means, if the law is to be strictly interpreted, that in the event of a session lasting exactly fifty days, no indemnity whatever shall be paid to any member of parliament. This anomaly can be corrected by amending section 32 to read:

> For every session of parliament which extends over a period of fifty days or more,

Another anomaly which we desire to have corrected is the following condition which now exists. If a member of the House of Commons is called away from the House on Thursday afternoon and does not return until the following Monday, he is penalized for three days' absence. If he leaves on Friday afternoon and does not return until the following Tuesday, he is penalized for only one day's absence. We believe this to be unfair and we recommend that in both cases, the member should be treated in the same manner.

Another inconsistency requires correction. If a member from western Canada is called home in the month of March owing to the serious illness of a member of his family, and is absent for fifteen days, but is regularly in attendance throughout the remainder of the session, he receives his full sessional indemnity. If an hon. member for some distant constituency is obliged to return home during the month of June by reason of family sickness, even if he has not been absent during the preceding months of the session, he is fined $25 for each day that he is absent. We recommend that in both cases, the member should receive the same treatment.

The press in some of its articles has led the public to believe that our desire was to allow any member to leave this House during the last fifteen days of the session without being fined. That is not the spirit of our recommendation which is merely to extend the same rule from the beginning to the end of each session. We consider that important legislation may be introduced in the first part of a session as well as in the last days, and that a member who is called away by any matter of urgent importance in his constituency or for any well recognized personal reason should be treated in the same way whether he is absent during the first or the last days of the session.

There is only one other important change proposed. It has been pointed out that under our resolution we have done away with the clause in the amended act which provides that a member must be present for at least three-fourths of the sitting days of the session in order to be entitled to his full sessional indemnity. It is stated that in certain sessions this may operate to the advantage of

a member. It must also be said that in many other sessions it will operate to his disadvantage. In the case of a session lasting eight or nine weeks, under the law as we propose to amend it, every member must have at least fifty days of attendance in order to receive his full sessional indemnity. If not he receives only $25 for each day of attendance. Under the old law if the session lasted more than fifty days, and the member was present for three-quarters of the sitting days, he received his full indemnity. We did not find this to be absolutely just and right, owing to the fact that the entire membership cannot receive its indemnity unless the session extends over a period of fifty days, and we considered that like under the old act, the individual member should be treated the same as the entire House. This amendment would certainly not relieve a member from any hardship in earning his sessional indemnity and in many instances, it would necessitate a longer attendance than that which is necessary under the present law.

May I be allowed to repeat that the finding of the committee in all these respects was absolutely unanimous. I submit the report to the House in the firm hope that it will be adopted with equal unanimity. When concurred in, this report will not be binding upon the government but I feel sure the government will be directed by the unanimous voice of the House, and that as requested by the committee the required legislation will be introduced during the present session to correct and do away with the anomalies and inconsistencies to which I have briefly referred.

Mr. SHAW: What were the reasons given in parliament for the legislation which it is now proposed to amend?

Mr. BOIVIN: I have before me the debates of the House of Commons of June 28, 1920, when the amending bill was introduced by Sir Robert Borden. That was one of the last sittings of the session, and no detailed reasons for all the amendments were then given, except that the sessional indemnity was being increased from $2,500 to $4,000 and that it was desired to make the rules concerning the attendance of members in the House more rigid than they had been under the then existing act. This intention is carried out by the amending legislation now proposed. Under the old law, the attendance of a member and the length of session necessary to enable him to receive the full indemnity was only thirty days; that has been extended to fifty days. Under the old law the absence allowed a member was fifteen days; that has been maintained in spite of the fact that sessions are now much longer. Under the old law the penalty for every day of non-attendance was only $15; that has been increased to $25.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Just a word as the seconder of the motion. It has always been the rule in this House not to oppose the unanimous report made by a committee to the House. I hope that in connection with the present report, no departure will be made by the government from this very commendable custom.

Mr. LOGAN: I would point out that there is another anomaly that has not been rectified. If a member is ill and confined to hospital in Ottawa, he may come in on the last day of the session and draw his full indemnity of $4,000, whereas if he is so unfortunate, as I was, to be confined to a hospital in Montreal, he is penalized, as I understand I am, to the extent of something over $1,000.

Mr. GAUVREAU: No.

Mr. LOGAN: Yes, because I was not in hospital in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. LEWIS: It seems to me there is another anomaly. If a member from the West goes home because of illness in his family, it takes him fifteen days to get there and back. If the House sits only fifty-five days, under the new rule that member will lose his right to get the full sessional indemnity. Moreover, the House has to be forced to sit sixty-five days before any member who has taken fifteen days leave of absence can get in his full time. I do not know that it is wise always to force the House to sit sixty-five days if the business to be transacted does not call for it.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 223, to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914.

He said: This bill provides that the annual fee for salmon canneries shall be $20 a year. It is to follow the recommendation of the committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Instead of what?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Instead of $500; but they are paying in addition to that a fee for every case of 48 one-pound cans.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

FOREST FIRES

PROPOSED RELIEF FOR SUFFERERS IN TEMISCOUATA, GASPE, BONAVENTURE AND NEW BRUNSWICK

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): I would like to place before the government what I consider to be a case of urgency. The county of Temiscouata, which I have the honour to represent in this House, is passing through a severe calamity. Bush fires have already swept away more than six villages; churches, homes, barns, implements, cattle and crops are in ashes. I have in my hand a wire which I received last night from the parish of Sully, asking the government for support and relief for the unfortunate settlers in that part of the country. I am told by the press that over six hundred families are without shelter, food or clothing. May I ask the government, may I ask this House, if it is possible to vote forthwith a sum of money for the relief of these settlers? It is true that as yet there is no loss of life, but the loss of property certainly runs into millions of dollars. I appeal to the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues to come to the rescue of these poor people who have lost in a few hours all that they had in the world. I appeal especially to the Acting Minister of Defence (Mr. Macdonald) to do as was done for Ontario last year, namely, to send food, clothing and supplies, and especially to send all the tents that are available in order that temporary shelter may be afforded to the settlers, their wives and children, in the devastated area.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might say to my hon. friend that I received a wire on Saturday night along somewhat similar lines to that which he has received, and immediately I got in touch with the Department of National Defence, and word was sent that the department would be very glad to render assistance such as was rendered in former cases where there has been suffering through fires. It was pointed out, however, that in these matters the federal government has generally proceeded in co-operation with the provincial governments, and it was suggested that the parties affected should immediately communicate with their provincial government, and have the provincial officers communicate with us. The matter will be followed up.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I would like to support the application made by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), and as the Prime Minister is inquiring into these fires I would point out that great damage to property has been done by fire in other constituencies. I understand that the county of Gaspé, represented by His Honour the Speaker, is suffering in that respect, as well as the county of Bonaventure and other counties in that region. So, if the matter is to be investigated, I hope these constituencies will not be overlooked.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): I should like to say a few words on behalf of New Brunswick, one of the smallest provinces of the Dominion, but the one that has practically suffered the most. Conditions there, judging by the morning papers, are very regrettable. A great many families there are without shelter, and, as the hon. member for Temiscouata has said, without food and clothing also. I hope the Prime Minister will take into consideration not only that part of the province of Quebec where assistance is asked at this moment, but also the province of New Brunswick.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READING

Bill No. 221 (from the Senate), respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Hudson.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 207 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abraham Brooks.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 209 (from the Senate), for the relief of Clara Welleena Bristol.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 210 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emma Jean Walker.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 211 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ella Maude Gee.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 212 (from the Senate), for the relief of Enid Louise MacDonald.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 213 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Theresa MacIsaac.—Mr. German.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REGIMENTAL FUNDS

Mr. MAYBEE:

What was the amount of the regimental funds at the end of the war, and what was the disposition of same?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD:

In the case of units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force other than those of a draft producing nature or which had a constantly changing personnel, the regimental, canteen and other funds were, upon the unit being

depleted, handed over to trustees appointed by the unit, to be used for the benefit of ex-members of the unit and their dependents, in accordance with the terms of Order in Council P.C. 1445, dated 29th May, 1917. No information is available in the department as to the amount of the unexpended balances of these funds held by the trustees at the end of the war. In the case, however, of units of a draft-producing nature or which had a constantly changing personnel, the regimental, canteen and other funds were, upon the unit being depleted, transferred to the Receiver-General in accordance with Orders in Council, P.C. 1856, dated 6th September, 1919, and P.C. 3144, dated 18th December, 1920.

According to the records of the Department of National Defence, the amount held by the Receiver-General in the special trust account created under Order in Council No. 1856, was $102,663.69, as at 31st August, 1921, the official date of the end of the war. According to the records of the Department of National Defence, the amount held by the Receiver-General in the special trust account created under Order in Council No. 3144, was $313,-764.94, as at 31st August, 1921, the official date of the end of the war.

There have been no withdrawals except to satisfy claims received after deposits had been made and which claims were properly chargeable to the units' funds.

TORONTO VIADUCT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Does the government intend to carry out a certain contract and agreement regarding the erection of a viaduct at Toronto, dated 1913?
2. If not, why not?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING (for the Minister of Railways): The Toronto viaduct question will be dealt with, not by the government, but by the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the city of Toronto. It is understood that the present management is giving attention to the question of terminal arrangements at Toronto, and that the matter will be dealt with in due course.

BANK OF VANCOUVER

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. What was the date of the failure of the Bank of Vancouver?
2. Was the government a creditor? If so, for how much?
3. What was the amount of the preferred claims, and have they been paid in full?
4. What was the amount of claims by depositors, what per cent of their claims have they received up to date, and are any further payments being made to depositors?
5. Do depositors in this case rank as ordinary creditors?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. 14th December, 1914.
2. No.
3. $463,388.60, not paid in full.
4. $349,590.46, on which no payment has yet been made. The liquidation has not been completed.
5. Yes.

TRAFFIC, HUDSON STRAIT

Mr. KNOX:

1. How many trips were made by tramp steamer, lighters and other craft carrying construction material through the Hudson bay straits to Port Nelson in each of the years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916 and 1917?
2. Was the cargo successfully delivered at Port Nelson in each case?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING (for the Minister of Railways):

TABLE showing the number of trips made by steamships, sail ships, lighters and other craft carrying construction material through the Hudson Straits to Port Nelson in each of the years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916 and 1917, with particulars as to the successful delivery of the cargo.

Season	Number of Trips				Particulars as to successful delivery of cargo
	Steamships	Sail ships	Department tugs and lighters	Total trips	
1913.....	9	.....	2	11	Two steamships under ton rate charters (*Cearense* and *Alette*) grounded in the Nelson Estuary, but cargoes were partly salvaged by the Department's forces at Port Nelson. Both steamers were a total loss. Ten per cent of the cargo of the steamship *Alcazar* was not delivered through lack of facilities for quick discharging at Port Nelson. All other cargoes were successfully delivered.
1914.....	9	2	4	15	All cargoes successfully delivered.
1915.....	10	1	.....	11	All cargoes successfully delivered.
1916.....	4	.....	.....	4	All cargoes successfully delivered.
1917.....	1	.....	.....	1	Cargo successfully delivered.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ARCTIC ISLANDS EXPEDITION

Mr. PARENT:

1. Does the government intend to send an expedition to the Arctic Islands during this year? If so, for what purpose?

2. Has the government at its disposal, for the said purpose, a vessel by the name of Arctic?

3. Has said vessel ever made trips into Arctic regions?

If so, (a) On what dates;

(b) Who were the members of the crew;

(c) How many government departments were represented on said vessel, and what are the names of said representatives and their respective salaries;

(d) What was the cost of said expeditions, and expenses incurred by each department?

4. Does the government intend to specially equip one or more vessels for the Arctic regions? Is so, what amount has been agreed upon for each of these vessels?

5. Has the department established Mounted Police Posts in certain localities of said regions? If so, how many men are at present in said localities and what are their duties?

6. Does the government intend to send artists to above regions to take moving pictures?

7. Has the government any knowledge of a murder being committed in those regions? If so, what measures have been taken to bring the supposed murderers to trial?

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—MISSISQUOI AND BROME

Mr. KAY:

1. How many farms have been bought by the Soldiers' Settlement Board for returned men in the counties of Missisquoi and Brome, up to January 1st, 1923?

2. How many have been bought since that date?

3. How many returned men are still on these farms?

4. How many farms have been sold owing to the failure of settlers, and what are the names of these settlers?

FEEDING STUFFS

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

That it is expedient to amend the Feeding Stuffs Act, chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1920, and to provide,—

1. That no person shall import into, manufacture, sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale in Canada, any flour mill by-product resulting from the cleaning and milling of wheat for the production of flour by the usual commercial processes, unless,

(a) the container or tag or label attached thereto is branded or marked as prescribed;

(b) the bran, pure shorts, middlings or feed flour are free from admixture of any foreign materials;

(c) the bran, pure shorts, shorts and mill screenings, middlings or feed flour meet the requirements as to protein and fat content, fineness and quality established by the regulations, and contain no crude fibre in excess of the percentage by weight as prescribed;

(d) the shorts and mill screenings are first registered as a commercial feeding stuff and contain not more than the mill run of screenings and scourings removed from the wheat from which shorts was obtained.

2. That no person shall manufacture pure shorts and shorts and mill screenings at the same mill.

3. That the sale in Canada, or the importation, of any feeding stuff found to be adulterated or incorrectly or misleadingly tagged, labelled or named, shall be a violation of the act, and the minister may cancel any registration and prohibit the further sale or importation of any such feeding stuff.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

EXPORT ACT—PULPWOOD

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend section seven of the Export Act; chapter fifty of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as enacted by chapter thirty of the statutes of 1914, by providing that the Governor in Council may by regulation prohibit the exportation from Canada of pulpwood of the variety, kind, place of origin or having the particulars of identification or ownership or production described in the regulation.

He said: His Excellency, the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister say whether or not, if the legislation contemplated goes into effect, it is the intention of the government still to appoint the commission he referred to in his budget speech, and if it is the intention that the government be empowered to act by order in council on the report of that commission?

Mr. FIELDING: We may decide to take that course but I would suggest that my right hon. friend renew his question when the resolution is being considered in committee; it is not debatable at the present stage. When we take the matter up in committee I will be happy to answer my right hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ISSUE OF SECURITIES

Mr. Fielding moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Canadian National Railways Act, 1919, and to provide that no securities as defined in section 26 of the said act, including in such definition equipment certificates or obligations in any form intended to be issued to the public, shall be issued, except those approved as to

form, terms and amount by the Governor in Council, and that such securities so approved may be guaranteed by His Majesty.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE NOT DEBATABLE—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

On motion of Mr. Fielding for the House to go into committee on Bill 83, respecting banks and banking.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is not debatable according to rule 17A, of the rules of the House. I had anticipated, after inquiry from some hon. members as to the procedure at this stage of the bill, that possibly there would be some proposal to move an amendment or engage in some debate. I have looked very carefully into the question and find that the present motion is not debatable—that is, the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair to go into committee of the whole, is not debatable. This opinion is based on the decision of Mr. Speaker Rhodes, my immediate predecessor, on 15th October, 1919, when Hon. J. D. Reid, then Minister of Railways and Canals, moved that the House go into committee to consider certain resolutions regarding the Grand Trunk Railway system—see Hansard for 1919, second session, volume 2, page 1012-13; also upon the decision of Mr. Speaker Rhodes on 29th August, 1917, that a motion for the reading of resolutions from Supply and concurrence therein was not debatable—see Hansard for 1917, volume 5, page 5095; also upon the opinion of Sir Robert Borden in explaining the meaning of rule 17A. I quote Sir Robert Borden's very words—see Hansard, 1912-13, volume 4, page 7406:

> What we have sought to do is to provide that all substantial motions, which bring into question the propriety of passing any bill, measure, or vote, shall be debatable. . . . but that purely formal motions, which, under the existing rules, would be used only for dilatory purposes, shall not in future continue to be debatable.

I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to rule 17A, which, probably, might better be explained by its author, whom I see in his seat now, the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), which rule must be read very carefully. The rule says:

> Every motion heretofore debatable made upon routine proceedings, except adjournment motions and every motion standing on the order of the proceedings for the day, or for the concurrence in a report of a standing or a special committee, or for the previous question, or for the third reading of a bill, or for the adjournment of the House when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, or for the adoption, in committee of the whole, or of supply, or of ways and means of the resolution, clause, section, preamble or title under consideration shall be debatable; but all other motions shall be decided without debate or amendment. As hon. members will see, there is not in the enumeration of debatable motions, made under this rule, any such motion as the present one.

There can, however, be a vote on this motion but there can be no debate. I also call the attention of hon. members to rule 28 which says:

> Bills reported after second reading—

Which is the present case, the bill having been read a second time and referred to the committee on Banking and Commerce—

> —from any standing or special committee, shall be placed on the orders of the day following the reception of the report, for reference to a committee of the whole House in their proper order next after bills reported from committees of the whole House. And bills ordered by the House for reference to a committee of the whole House shall be placed, for such reference, on the orders of the day following the order of reference in their proper order, next after bills reported from any standing or special committee.

The present bill is therefore regularly on its way to the committee of the whole House and the motion has been made that I do now leave the chair. It is a purely formal motion. When the bill is in committee of the whole amendments can be moved to the various clauses or sections of the measure. When the bill is reported from committee of the whole to the Speaker, and consequently to the House, the occasion again presents itself to those who may have some opposition to offer to advance their views and their grievances. And finally when the third reading comes, the opponents of the bill, or of some of the principles involved in it, can again ventilate their views. Therefore at the present stage, as this is a formal motion and being supported in my opinion by the author of rule 17A and by the precedents which apply, I rule that the present motion is not debatable. Nevertheless, as I said a moment ago, a vote can be taken on the motion that I do now leave the Chair if there is any objection to the bill.

Mr. BIRD: I would not presume to question the authorities cited in your ruling Mr. Speaker, but just to indicate the usage, or rule, upon which my action is taken I will refer to page 606 of Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure in which that authority expresses himself as follows:

When the order of the day for committee has been reached and called in due form, the Speaker will put the question, "That I do now leave the chair". Now is the time to move any amendment to this question. Members opposed to the bill may move that the House resolve itself into committee that day three or six months; or may propose motions adverse to the principle or policy of the measure.

It has been frequently decided in the English House that on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair, a member is at liberty to discuss the main provisions, but not to proceed in detail through the clauses nor to discuss amendments to the same until the bill is regularly in committee.

It was my purpose not to discuss amendments of details, but rather to bring to the attention of the House certain very important principles that are involved in the recent Merchants Bank case.

Mr. SPEAKER: In order to be fair to the hon. member, I might recall to himself and to the House that when Bourinot, and later, Flint, commenting on Bourinot, expressed the views which the hon. member has just read, rule 17A was not in existence. This is a new rule. It was enacted in 1912-13. I was a member of the House when it was enacted. I opposed it strenuously, and I was defeated at that time with many others. I was aware of the views expressed by Bourinot and by Flint, but they fall to the ground when one realized that rule 17A was enacted after those views were expressed.

Mr. GOOD: May I speak to the question of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GOOD: Would it be possible by unanimous consent to waive the rule?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling, and as I stated a moment ago, if it is not the wish of the House that the Speaker leave the chair, a vote can be taken. But I take it for granted that the motion is carried and, therefore, I leave the chair.

BANK ACT—IN COMMITTEE

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

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. GOOD: We have received no copies of the amended bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was distributed on Friday.

The CHAIRMAN: Copies have already been distributed. If the hon. member will look at his file, he should find a copy.

Mr. GOOD: It is not on my file; it is not in the post office, and I have not received any copies. I understood that we would not be expected to proceed with the bill unless we had copies.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill was distributed on Friday.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Definitions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is fair to the members to rush on in this way until they can locate their copies of the bill. I know I was given a copy of the bill and I put it on my desk on Friday; but I cannot locate it myself, and it is not on my file. I am quite sure that the bill was distributed, but copies are not on our files.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A copy is on my file, and I think a copy should be on everybody's file.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see it is in the middle of the file.

Mr. FIELDING: It is in the proper place having regard to its number.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I think the time has come in the discussion of this bill, when I may with perfect propriety make a few remarks; also probably at the close of my remarks, I may find occasion to move an amendment. During the discussion of this bill before the Banking and Com-
4 p.m. merce committee, I took occasion to bring forward a resolution asking for postponement of the revision of the act and asking that charters should be extended for one year. This proposal was not acceptable to the committee. As a matter of fact, the proposal itself was ruled out of order in the committee as not being within our powers at that time. My reasons for bringing forward that motion were several, but I shall state them very briefly. I am speaking now, not for purposes of obstruction, or simply because I wish to be contradictory to the action of the committee or of this House, but because, rightly or wrongly, I have come to the conclusion that the best interests of the country will not be guaranteed by passing this particular clause in this particular shape.

In the first place we have had a great deal of discussion in committee and have taken an enormous mass of evidence. I think the committee has worked faithfully and has tried

fairly to bring out all the information along most, but not all, of the points which have been suggested. During the course of that discussion several points came up in my mind very strongly. The main points that impressed me—or amongst the main points—were these: Throughout the evidence, throughout the statements made by the leading bankers of this country who were there to testify it became so evident as not possibly to be gainsaid that the present banking system, as carried out under the present Bank Act, did not wholly meet all the financial requirements of the various industries in this country. It became apparent, in fact it was admitted, that, in regard to the principal industry of this country, that of agriculture, the Bank Act was not functioning satisfactorily. Statements were made and evidence was adduced which covered that point, and I think it was established to the satisfaction of the majority of the committee that one industry at least, that of farming, was not able to take full advantage of the provisions of this act, and was not able to secure the credit requisite to the carrying on of their business under the present banking system It was shown that the system which was embodied in the act, and carried on under the provisions of this act, was adapted very admirably for the purposes of commercial banking, for the carrying on of the ordinary classes of industry; but, by reason of the fact that advances could only be made under the provisions of this act by our present banks as at present constituted for a short term, it became absolutely ineffective for the needs of agriculture. That, I think, was admitted. It was admitted by many of the bankers, though contradicted by others, and I think it was the consensus of opinion, not only in the committee among the experts, the financial men themselves who gave evidence before that committee, that, under the way in which the banks were carried on, under the methods by which they secured the funds with which they carried on their work, they could not make provision for the industry of agriculture on any general scale. It was shown that, whereas in ordinary commercial life, a loan for three or six months might be amply adequate by reason of the fact that the turnover occurs three or four times a year, the case with the farmer was absolutely different. It was shown, and had to be admitted by everyone cognizant of the conditions under which farming was carried on, that a loan, in order to have any effect, to enable farmers to carry on under any system of credit, should be at least for one year; and in the case of a farmer engaged in the cattle business, should be extended for three years. I am not speaking of long loans for capital outlay, but for current loans to carry on the yearly operations of the farm. I think that was distinctly proved.

The point of controversy then came up, could this be carried out, or could these loans be made by the banks at all, and could it possibly be comprehended within the Bank Act? And there is where the difference of opinion occurred. I think I am correct in my first statement that the general need was admitted, and the general inadequacy of the banks to fulfil that need was admitted, and the difference of opinion arose as to whether, under any act or any circumstances, the banks could supply that need. I may say that it was on that point that I personally was not at all satisfied with the attitude of some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, men who were fully familiar with the details of the banking profession, who had, for many years past, the handling of the savings of the people of this country and the use of those savings as applied to the various industries of the country. They acknowledged in many cases that the banks as at present carried on were inadequate. They acknowledged that in many cases the banks did not and could not meet the requirements of agriculture in particular; and yet at the same time, although those men were supposed at least to have full knowledge of their subject, and to have given a full and complete study of banking, the business of their lives, they were not prepared to accept any responsibility for this failure or to bring forward any suggestion of value in order to meet the needs. In that respect I was dissatisfied, and I may say I was disappointed in their attitude.

We do not come here speaking for farmers simply, we do not come asking for anything which would be to the public detriment, and we do not come advocating, at the present time at least, any violent departure from any stable system of banking or economics. Those ideas were brought forward and discussed, though not given the consideration that I think was due them. But at the present time we are not advocating, and I am not advocating, the establishment of any system of banking which would not be for the public good and which would not be founded on sound and sane business principles. But we do look to these men who have taken the place in the commercial life of this country, as being the men most

familiar with finance, to offer some remedy to meet the obvious conditions which prevail. But they did not. They absolutely failed, and I, for one, am not prepared to absolve them from responsibility in the matter. I am not prepared to say to them: The system under which you have been working is perfect, and the method under which you have carried it on is absolutely beyond reproach. I am not prepared to say to them: We will give you the power to carry on under the same act, in the same way, until you are able to show we can get relief in some other way. At the present time—and, of course, this was brought by way of objection to any discussion of this point in our committee—the subject of rural credits is being examined into, and is under discussion before another committee. That committee has not yet reported. Until that committee does report, and until we know what the suggested remedies to meet that existing condition may be, we do not feel—many of us in this corner of the House at least—that the present banks should be given a charter extending over ten years, enabling them to tie up and utilize practically all of the available capital in the country, all the savings of the people, some of which would have to be applied to any system of rural credits. We ask first to be told what the suggestions are and what the legislation may be to bring those suggestions into effect, and to what extent, if any, it will affect our present banking. These are reasons why I object to passing this clause at the present time and in its present shape.

There is another reason, a supplementary reason. When this act came up for discussion, we received, and the Minister of Finance no doubt received, communications from many public bodies in this country. We received communications from the legislature of Alberta, asking that the final revision of this act be postponed for one year, and that the present charters be extended for one year, and one year only. The reasons they gave were the reasons I have mentioned. They are confronted in that province with a serious situation as regards financing their agricultural conditions. Agriculture is the one great outstanding industry of that province, and not only is that industry of outstanding importance there, but we believe—and I do not wish to speak sectionally—that agriculture in those western provinces is, and must be of paramount importance, to the whole industrial life of the country. They are faced with the condition that they are being continually requested to establish provincial banks to provide some way of financial relief, some system under which agriculture can receive its due quota of the money of the country, and they feel that they should not be tied up for a term of ten years until they have had time to study the points brought forward in the Banking committee, until they have had time to confer with the government and with the bankers to see whether they can jointly bring forward some change in the present Bank Act which will enable our banking system to adequately meet that condition. The government of Manitoba made a request on similar lines. They requested that the charters should be extended for one year only, in order that the provincial government might be able to weigh the evidence which has been adduced before the committee and have an opportunity, in consultation with their financial experts, with the bankers, with the Finance department and with the Dominion government, to suggest such amendments as they might deem necessary. The Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing agriculture as a whole throughout the Dominion, made the same request from the same point of view exactly, recognizing the inadequacy of the present system to meet the needs of the farmer, recognizing the paramount necessity of prosperity among the farmers in its relation to the national welfare, and recognizing that in the short space of time at their disposal they could not possibly make the suggestions which they thought might be made to the bankers and to the Dominion government. Therefore, they asked that the revision of the Bank Act be postponed for one year to give them an opportunity to take the necessary action in the meantime. The same request has come from our labour organizations. Of course, they are not treating the subject from exactly the same point of view. They point out that the banks have failed to some extent in their functions, that they are not financing the exchange of goods in a manner satisfactory to the people.

I am simply speaking for the people I know. We have no objections to a sound banking system being put into effect, a system that stands foursquare and sound from every point of view—from the point of view of industry, of commerce, of agriculture. We believe in a banking system which is sane, but which also, as I say, is equitable and will function satisfactorily for the benefit of all people requiring banking assistance. This, I think, the present banking system was proved before the committee not to be doing today.

There are other points of view which I might take into consideration and discuss, and one of the most important to my mind is this. It is a fact well known to members of parlia-

ment, and particularly to members of the Banking committee, that great dissatisfaction with our banking system has arisen throughout a large part of the Dominion. It is a dissatisfaction which is not based on absolutely accurate knowledge, and it has given rise to all kinds of suggestions for improving the system. The people are demanding improvements with the nature of which they are not altogether familiar; they are asking for things which may not be sound; they are following men who may not have made a thorough study of the subject. I am not discussing whether that is so or not, but the fact remains that the number of people looking for relief in this way is increasing daily. Consequently, one of the reasons why I am so strongly in favour of having a thorough investigation into the whole system of credits is because I am convinced that, if the people were given an opportunity of having these men before the committee and having their ideas criticized by those who at least are supposed to be capable of criticism, and the people at home might read the evidence and judge how those ideas might or might not work out in practice, then if they came to the conclusion that they had been following false gods, that the theories placed before them were not sound, they would turn their attention to better and sounder ideas.

But what is the fact now? The people amongst whom this dissatisfaction is growing know that this subject has been under discussion most thoroughly before the committee; they know that the men in whom they have come to believe in great measure have submitted their suggestions to the committee, and that those suggestions have been criticized; but the people are not aware of everything that has been brought forward by way of suggestion or criticism. And if this act goes through now for a term of ten years, what will they think? They will simply say: What is the use of reading the evidence, what is the use of studying the various systems proposed, what is the use of the committee on Banking and Commerce working for three or four months upon this Bank Act if parliament ties everything up for another ten years before we have an opportunity of studying the matter? It seems to me they will think that all these weaknesses which have been stated to be inherent in the Bank Act actually exist. I am not taking that view, but I do know that a great many people will think as I have indicated.

But it has been said, and said rightly, that the foundation of every good banking system lies not in its gold reserve but in the unshaken confidence of the people, and that this is the only way in which any such system can function satisfactorily. I think the best way to secure that unshaken confidence is to have the people thoroughly acquainted with everything that led up to the granting of these charters. Let them know exactly what the Bank Act means, let them know exactly what suggestions were made and why they were not acceptable. If our banking system is sound, the best way to convince the people of the fact is to let them study the Bank Act before it is crystallized for another ten years. That is one of my strongest reasons for opposing the passing of the act in its present form. As others, no doubt, desire to speak on this subject, and as I only wished to bring forward what to my mind were some of the strongest points against this proposed revision, I shall simply move, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke):

> That section 5 of Bill 83 be amended by striking out the words "thirty-three" in the fourth and eighteenth lines thereof, and substituting the words "twenty-four" therefor.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, the views presented by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Speakman) and by others along the same lines and in relation to various other aspects of the banking question, were put before the committee very fully and in many cases, I can say, with great zeal and great ability. The whole matter was fully considered with the utmost care, and I doubt if any measure submitted to the House has received more careful consideration than was given by the committee to the bill now before us. The best judgment of the committee, after hearing witnesses, after doing all that could be done for the intelligent discussion of the subject, was that the objections raised by these gentlemen were not very well sustained. There is a condition of affairs in the West which has alarmed some hon. gentlemen. I am largely of opinion that one good crop in the West—let us pray Heaven that it come this year—will remove very much of the irritation that exists among our western friends. At all events, after the discussion before the Banking committee, after the publication of the evidence—for every word was printed and is available, the newspapers have printed it very largely and the whole question has been threshed out in the light of public opinion—I believe that to-day the people of Canada are fully informed of all the essential questions involved in this present motion.

I think no good purpose can be served by our engaging in an extensive discussion

of the question. I am going to presume—it may be presumption—to offer a suggestion to my hon. friends opposite. It is their right and their duty to place themselves on record against a measure of which they do not approve. But I point out to them that in committee they cannot reach any very satisfactory result, because they cannot get their names recorded in a vote. May I suggest, if it be not inconsistent with the general purposes of my hon. friends opposite, that they facilitate the passing of this bill through Committee of the Whole and let it come as quickly as may be to third reading? Then they will have the right to discuss, not a particular clause but the whole bill; they will have the right to make any motion they wish to offer by way of postponement, or in any other form, and they will have the right to get then what they cannot get in committee, a recorded vote. I can only make the suggestion to my hon. friends. I want, if I can, to put myself in their position, to see things from their point of view; and I think that would serve their purpose better than an extended discussion in committee. I recognize, however, the fact that it is the right of these hon. gentlemen to pursue the course they think best. But I repeat that in view of all the discussion that has taken place, in view of the printing of all the evidence; in view of the widespread publication of the discussions of the committee in the public press, I do not think the people will expect us to engage in a very protracted discussion of the subject in the House.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) suggests that we ought not at this stage to discuss the question. I would remind him that he made the same plea on the second reading of the bill, and that the bill went to the committee without any discussion on the floor of the House. It is true that there has been a lengthy discussion in committee, extending over some five weeks, and it is for the very reason that we have had a full discussion there that some of us feel that the matter ought not to be hurriedly passed through the House. It was very clearly revealed in the committee that, with respect to a vast number of considerations that came under review and were the subject of more or less discussion, there was undoubtedly no opportunity for the public to form an opinion or to express an opinion in any effective manner. It is for that reason that I should like to support the resolution for the postponement of this whole question for another year.

[Mr. Fielding.]

This is not a question that affects merely the banks. Some have been inclined to regard the matter as one very largely for the bankers; and we had in the committee five or six representatives of the bankers who were following the discussions very closely indeed. But it is not a matter merely for the financial or legal experts; if it were, some of us would have very little to say with regard to it. But the very fact that the banks must come before parliament and obtain their charters and secure the conditions under which they must operate is an indication that in this as in other important matters the voice of the people must be the deciding factor. After all, the great majority of the common people look at these things in a different way from that in which they are regarded by the bankers. So I see no reason why those of us who represent the people should not call attention to the need for further discussion of this measure.

In the very first place, the banks are seeking an immensely valuable public franchise; they are claiming the right to issue currency, a right that is given to no other private corporation. But, more than that, under the act they secure a virtual monopoly of the credit system of the country. Let us consider what that really means. It means the power to determine very largely what can be produced, where it can be produced and under what conditions it can be produced. Financial considerations are vital to the whole of the industrial life of this country; they underlie all our industrial and commercial life. They are therefore closely related to the life of the people and cannot lightly be passed by.

The clause now under consideration would give to the banks certain privileges for another ten years. I understand it is possible to alter these clauses from year to year, and I think a good many of us would like to give notice that if this amendment is voted down we propose to bring in legislation in subsequent years. It cannot be regarded as final legislation whichever way it goes; still we are told that there are opportunities for a complete revision, given every ten years that cannot be granted so readily during intervening years. This amendment shows no very great change from what we have had in the past and from what is regarded by a great many people as unsatisfactory. After all, why not delay? It seems to me that the burden of proof is on the bankers and those who are seeking to hurry through this legislation. We were told in the committee by the bank presidents that they did not want to pass through the ordeal of being cross-questioned in committee. Well,

I am sure that cannot be a very weighty consideration. We were told also in the committee that if the facts of the case were given to the public they might cause such general unrest as would produce very disastrous effects upon our financial system. I submit that we ought not to be afraid of full light being thrown upon all questions; and as to rushing through legislation for fear there may be disastrous effects, the sooner we know what is wrong with the existing system and the sooner the evil conditions are exposed, the better for all concerned. We submit that the evidence brought forth in the committee has shown that the present Bank Act, which is virtually the bill now before us, fails to meet all the needs. There is no provision whatever for the establishment of small banks; there is no safeguard against mergers on an even vaster scale than they have taken place in the past; there is no provision for long-term loans; no provision for work and the capacity to work being regarded as the basis upon which public loans may be obtained. On that latter point I put some questions in the committee to one of the bank managers, Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor. I asked him:

> Then what do you mean by collateral, what form has it to take?

He replied:

> Well my early teaching tells me that there are three forms of wealth in this world. There is the wealth of silver and gold and precious stones, cattle, houses, and lands. Physical wealth. Then there is the wealth of credit, which is based to a large extent on the possession of the first form of wealth, but not entirely and not necessarily wholly on the possession of physical wealth, and then there is the wealth of labour.
>
> Q. It was with regard to the third that I wanted to ask. Supposing I stand as a labourer, a man skilled in a certain trade, and I want to go to work. Would you regard that as in any sense security for my obtaining a loan?—A. No, that is not a basis for a banking loan, Mr. Woodsworth, because your ability to labour depends entirely on your ability to wield a spade or a pickaxe, or whatever it is you are going to labour at, and if an unkind fate, or if Providence should remove you from this sphere the day after you borrowed the money, the bank would have no security at all, because your labours would have ceased.
>
> Q. And yet labour is the basis or one of the bases rather of credit, Sir Frederick?—A. So it is. In the hypothetical case you put, you could borrow money from your grocer, doubtless, if you have a job, and from your bootmaker if you want a pair of boots, and so on; but it is not a good basis for a banking credit a man's mere ability to labour, unbacked by any form of security of any kind. Am I clear?
>
> Q. Yes sir. I had in view the case given to me by the Bureau of Labour the other day; of a thousand men waiting in my own city of Winnipeg, willing to work on farms, having farm experience and having families to look after, is there no way the bank would feel that their ability to work, taking the whole thousand of them, would form a basis on which money or credit could be given?—A. No, in no country in the world that I am aware of could a workman borrow merely on his ability to labour. Borrow from a bank.

Now, in view of the actual situation that we have about us, it is very clear that the institutions to which we grant a monopoly of the credit facilities of the country ought to make provision for some of these outstanding needs. I would charge that essentially this is class legislation, it is legislation in the interests of a comparatively small group in the community. As one studied this act during the weeks we have been sitting in the Banking and Commerce committee I think that a good many of us have felt that from the banker's standpoint it was a case of "heads I win, tails you lose." Further than that, it is not based, I take it, on solid economic foundations. We were assured by the bankers themselves again and again that they were not economists. We were told by the few economists that appeared before the committee that many of the principles enunciated were not in accordance with the established conclusions that are generally held in the world of economics to-day. It would seem that until we have further opportunity of studying this question and of bringing our banking arrangements into harmony with well known economic laws we should not pass this legislation. I notice in a recent number of the Montreal Standard of June 9th an editorial from which I quote this paragraph:

> It looks as if Liberals and Conservatives could not do better than bury the hatchet for the nonce, get together on a non-partisan measure—as the Bank Act is—and press it to a vote. What the Progressives think about it is comparatively unimportant, but it is important that this land of Canada should have a sound banking system.

Well, it may be unimportant what the Progressives or any other section of this House thinks about the Bank Act, but I submit that we are sent here, whether we are Progressives or not, in order to try to present the views of the people and to check up this legislation by what the people need and what the people think they need,—and there are a great many outside the circle of the bankers who are quite sure that we need a more extensive modification; indeed, I think that the Minister of Finance must confess that the discussions which have already taken place in the editorial columns of our papers would warrant us in urging that more serious consideration be given to the question.

We have been told that the amendments which have been proposed are altogether too radical in character. One writer in ridiculing some of the amendments brought forth

by Labour and Progressive members suggested that they were merely tomfool amendments. Well, what are some of these amendments that have been urged? One was that in view of the near-failure of the Merchants Bank—I think we were told that it was not a failure, that we must call it a "fiasco"—that in view of the fiasco of the Merchants Bank it was well worth studying what were the weaknesses of the banking system that made that fiasco possible, and how those weaknesses could be remedied. Another amendment related to keeping down the exorbitant rates of interest, and that surely is a matter of tremendous importance when some people in the West at least are required to pay nine and ten and even a higher per cent of interest. Another amendment that occurs to me was that a government auditor or inspector be appointed so that the whole of the statements of the banks would be brought under definite supervision. Other amendments related to the question of ensuring that the statements as made by the bank should be accurate statements. We were told that at least with regard to real estate holdings the statements as at present given to the government were not at all accurate. This was asserted by Sir Edmund Walker. Other amendments related to providing for small banks and co-operative banks. As we all know these exist in large numbers and have proven themselves very successful in other countries. Why should we not at least have the opportunity of establishing these banks in this country? We did not plead that the government should immediately proceed to establish the banks but we did ask that provision be made in the Bank Act that if men wanted to start small banks they should have a chance to do so, that if they wanted to establish co-operative banks they should have a chance to do so. There is no such opportunity in the Bank Act as it now stands.

I should like very briefly to summarize my conclusions with regard to some of the facts that were brought before us by the various witnesses who appeared before the Banking and Commerce committee. It was clearly shown that money was to-day the measure of all things and quite properly; that this was so much the case that in many instances money has been confused with capital. I think most of us recognize that capital after all consists of the natural resources and the equipment for working them, and it is only by an extension of the term that it is applied to include credit. To-day the title deeds to the great natural resources and the equipment by which they are worked are in the hands of a comparative few. I submit, though, that ownership itself is an empty thing unless there are some means by which a man can exploit those things which he owns, whether they be mines or water-powers or anything else. Yet under modern industrial conditions it is impossible even for the owner of these natural resources to exploit them without having to go to the banks in order to obtain credit. Money, then, is the key that opens the door to capital. Give me the key and you give me practical ownership. The bankers, I submit, hold to-day the key that admits us to the capital of this country.

Again, we are told that money is the medium of exchange. Since the discontinuance of the system of barter, it is quite necessary that we should have a recognized medium of exchange. But that means that the men who control this medium control the whole of our commercial operations, and this control, under present conditions, is centred in the hands of a comparatively small group. I am not going into an academic discussion to-day as to what money is. I think it was clearly shown by the various witnesses that Walker was right when he said years ago that "money is that money does." It does not make much difference whether money is coin, or paper, or various kinds of cheques, or victory bonds. Any of these things is really money if it performs the functions of money. So that to-day we find that money has come to occupy a monopolistic position as a medium of exchange. Exchange to-day has passed beyond the earlier stage of barter; it has become an impersonal thing We need some clearly recognized medium. Money has come to take that place and hence it is all-important that this medium of exchange should be understood, because the men who control the medium of exchange control, as I have said, our commercial life of to-day.

Let me pass to one more conclusion in this connection and that is this. It appears to be true, as the economists have told us for a great many years, that the quantity of money determines its value. We were told by some of the leading bankers that they had never heard of the quantitative theory of money; and yet, when questioned they had to admit that the amount of money in circulation, together with the rapidity of the circulation, had a very decided effect upon the value of money itself. Now under this act you give certain institutions the right to circulate a large amount of money. It is true that their circulation of gold is very limited indeed, it

is true that the circulation of their bank cheques is limited; but the greater part of money to-day is not gold, is not bank cheques, it consists of credits and these can be extended or limited by the action of the banks. Hence, to no small extent, they control the value of money itself. The money that buys one bushel of potatoes to-day may buy tomorrow two bushels of potatoes, or only half a bushel; and I submit that the people who control the money situation can very largely decide the value of that money. Or to put it the other way about: The value of money really means the price of other things. If we decide to issue a larger amount of money we cheapen money, and send the price of commodities soaring. That, at least, is the accepted view of political science. I submit that no such power as this should be placed in the hands of any groups of private individuals. It means that they control the whole life of every individual, it means that we cannot buy a single box of groceries, we cannot buy a suit of clothes, we cannot live in a house, we cannot go abroad to enjoy ourselves, without paying out money the value of which is determined by a group of people over whom we have no control whatever.

We were told, of course, by some of the bankers that we could not get away from the gold standard. And yet they had to admit that since the war we have no gold standard. I do not intend to enter at this time, at any length upon this question of the gold standard. I can remember in my college days we used to debate at considerable length the whole question of bi-metallism, but I submit that in the last few years we have learned a great deal more about the gold standard than we knew before the war. The fact is that Canada is not to-day on a gold standard. I have my own suspicions that all along the gold standard has been, after all, nothing much more than a barometer which recorded certain changes in the financial conditions. But to-day all that is passed. We know perfectly well that although our bank notes call for payment in gold, no gold is forthcoming. The bankers say that we are going to return to the gold standard. That may or may not be; it is altogether another matter. So we are faced with this situation: That not being on a gold standard and the banks having no obligation whatever to pay in gold, they are still coming to us and asking for a franchise that will extend for ten more years. Without considering the advisability of a return to the gold standard, I would suggest that the bankers might well offer to return to this standard before asking for a renewal of charters that are so valuable. On the question of the gold standard I was rather interested in a little illustration of how very ridiculous the gold standard is in actual practice. D. H. Robertson in his book on "Money" gives the following:

> It is said that there was once a mine manager in Johannesburg who had a glass eye. When business called him away he would take his eye out and leave it in a prominent place; and while the master's eye was on them the workmen continued to work like blacks, as indeed they were. But one day one of the workmen, more daring than the rest, stealthily approached the all-seeing orb and covered it up with an inverted cigarette tin: whereupon he and all his fellows promptly went away and got drunk.

Some of my Progressive friends and my colleague here (Mr. Irvine) would like to use inverted cigarette tin and cover up the glass eye. I would submit there is a great deal bigger question involved than the cigarette tin and that is, if the gold standard is no more than a glass eye, a bogey to frighten people with, we may well ask ourselves what is its stability as the very basic of our whole financial system to-day. Let me give you still another illustration which, I think, will do more to drive home this point than anything of an abstract character that I might advance. This is quoted by Mr. Robertson from the Economic Journal of June, 1915, page 281:

> There is among the Caroline Islands an island called Uap, whose money consists solely of huge stones called fei, many of them so large that they cannot be moved, so that even when they change hands in the course of business their physical location is left unchanged. . . . Some time ago the natives allowed the roads of the island to fall into disrepair, and steadily refused to mend them; and the Germans, who were at that time in possession of the island, had to devise some means of inflicting a fine. It was clearly useless to attempt to remove any of the stones from the island. "At last," so the account runs, "by a happy thought the fine was exacted by sending a man to every failu and pabai throughout the disobedient districts, where he simply marked a certain number of the most valuable fei with a cross in black paint to show that the stones were claimed by the government. This instantly worked like a charm; the people, thus dolefully impoverished, turned to and repaired the highways to such good effect from one end of the island to the other that they are now like park drives. Then the government despatched its agents and erased the crosses. Presto! the fine was paid, the happy failus resumed possession of their capital stock, and rolled in wealth.' Just so gold is a fetish, if you will, but it does the trick.

That is a plea for the gold standard by a man who clearly recognizes how little it really amounts to if one could understand its real meaning.

Now, my main reason for pleading for delay in the granting of these charters is that we have developed in Canada a financial monopoly, and that by granting the charters we

legalize this monopoly. The banks are reservoirs for the collection of deposits from the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The banks have the right to issue currency, a very valuable franchise, and they have the giving of credit. Perhaps these powers would not be so bad if they were very widely distributed. But the fact is that in the last few years we have seen merger upon merger taking place, and bank managers, according to their evidence, are inclined to think this amalgamation will continue. One of them at least said that he thought it was a very good thing to eliminate weak banks. But until such time as mergers actually take place, we have a Bankers' Association, formally recognized, that more or less accomplishes the same purposes as a merger, because we are told that the rates of interest were fixed by an arrangement made within the Bankers' Association. Thus you have a little group, practically a combine, that determines rates of interest and the terms upon which credits can be given. But, more serious perhaps than that, is the system which has grown up of interlocking directorates, by which men who control banks also control a considerable number of subsidiary financial institutions as well as various industrial concerns. I do not know if this is any discovery to some hon. members; but if we had not known of this fact before, it was very clearly brought to us as the investigations of the Banking committee proceeded.

Just recently I have been looking through the Annual Canadian Financial Review, and I should like to call the attention of the committee to some facts as revealed by a study of that publication. I quote from the issue of June 1922. I notice a large number of the gentlemen whose names are prominent in banking affairs, are also prominent in governmental circles. Perhaps that is to be expected. I notice a good many of them have the title "Sir" prefixed to their names. Under the old regime they were regarded as the most honourable and most worthy of honour amongst our Canadian citizens. I notice that a number of them are very prominent in educational work, in military activities, in all the social life of the country. That too, perhaps, is to be expected. I am not laying any blame upon those individuals because of the prominence that they have attained; but I should like to show that these men, because of acquiring a monopoly of the finacial credit of the country, have been able to dominate many of our industrial and commercial affairs. Let me take the Bank of Montreal, as an example. That bank is generally known as the government bank as it does a good part of the business of the government. The president is Sir Vincent Meredith, of Montreal. I notice he is also a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—a rival, by the way, of our own Canadian National Railways—he is president of the Royal Trust Company and a director of the Guarantee Company of North America. Thus the committee will see the group of companies in which one man can exercise a very large measure of control. Let me in this connection quote a paragraph from a book published some years ago by Judge Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court. He says:

> Directors, officers and employees of banking institutions should, by a similar provision, be disqualified from acting as directors, officers or employees of life insurance companies. The Armstrong investigation showed that life insurance companies were in 1905 the most potent factor in financial concentration. . . . and now instead of the life insurance companies controlling the banks and trust companies the latter and the bankers control the life insurance companies.

Again he says:

> Combination and control of other people's money and of other people's businesses are the main factors in the development of the money trust.

A few weeks ago I took the trouble to glance through the lists of shareholders of a number of the leading banks in Canada. It is quite true that there are no very large holdings by wealthy men. It is quite true that a very considerable number of the shares are held by comparatively poor people. That is the very point I want to make—that the savings of comparatively poor people are all pooled in the banks and then the control of these institutions is put into the hands of a very small group.

I see that the next name on the list of directors is Sir Charles Gordon, G.B.E., vice-president, Montreal. He is also a director of the Royal Trust Company—I might note in passing that the names frequently occur in groups; certain group domination is evident. He is also president of the Dominion Textile Company, president of the Montreal Cottons, president of the Montreal Cotton

5 p.m. Company, president of Penman's Limited, that is of companies manufacturing many articles which every household in the country requires and which more or less receive certain privileges through the tariff from the government of Canada. Further, he is a director of the Ogilvie Flour Mills,—that brings us to what we eat. He is also director of the Tuckett Tobacco Company, manufacturing one of the luxuries. He is also director of the Canadian Consolidated Rubber Company, president of the Dominion Glass Company, director of the Provincial Paper Mills, and president of the Hillcrest Collieries. I do not think any hon. member

would claim that one individual, even Sir Charles Gordon, has any expert knowledge of these various industries of which he is direc tor or, in many cases, president. I think we can clearly see that the only reason why he should be on those boards is because of his financial ability. That is, we have had the division of labour go on until the financial men form a group by themselves, and the people who actually do the manufacturing, whether the employees or the employers, the organizers and managers, do not really own the factories. The real ownership is with the financier. He controls, not merely one line of industry, but a host of industries widely varying in character. We have been told recently in the papers of the danger in Germany of such men as Stinnes getting control of a very large number of industries of different classes, not merely perpendicular control, but horizontal control; yet we have that selfsame system prevailing in Canada. Perhaps it is not without significance that this director of the Bank of Montreal who is director of so many other companies should have been last year appointed by this government as a member of the Canadian Economic Commission.

Again let me quote a paragraph from Judge Brandeis. Speaking of other people's money and how the bankers use it, he says:

> The control of these institutions means the ability to lend a large part of these funds, directly and indirectly to themselves; and, what is often even more important, the power to prevent the funds being lent to any rival interests.

He further says:

> But far more serious even than the suppression of competition is the suppression of industrial liberty, indeed of manhood itself, which this overweening financial power entails. The intimidation which it effects extends far beyond the banks, trust companes and other institutions, seeking participation, from this inner group, in their lucrative undertakings, and far beyond those interested in the great corporations directly dependent upon the minor group. Its blighting and benumbing effect extends as well to the small and seemingly independent business men, to the vast army of professional men and others directly dependent upon "big business", and to many another.

And he goes on to elaborate his argument. I think it is hardly necessary to comment on the criticism of Judge Brandeis on the system which had grown up a few years ago in the United States, and which is so rapidly developing here in Canada.

The next name on the directorate of the Bank of Montreal is R. B. Angus, of Montreal, director of the Royal Trust Company, a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a director of the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie railway company, a director of the Laurentide Paper Company, a director of the Canada Northwest Land Company. Thus we see the organization extended not merely to Montreal and its vicinity, but away to the western country. The next name is that of Lord Shaughnessy, K.C., V.O., Montreal, director of the Royal Trust Company, director of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, director of the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, director of the Canada Northwest Land Company. The next is C. R. Hosmer, Esquire, Montreal, director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, director of the Commercial Cable Company, director of the Sun Life Assurance Company, director of the Royal Trust Company, director of the Canadian Cottons Company, director of the Dominion Textile Company, president of the Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, president of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, director of the Canada Paper Company, director of the Laurentide Company, vice-president of the Kaministiquia Power Company, director of the Montreal Light, Heat & Power Company.

Let me quote another paragraph from Judge Brandeis:

> Senator Owens, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Commerce said: "My own judgment is that a bank is a public utility institution, and cannot be treated as a private affair for the simple reason that the public is invited, under the safeguards of the government, to deposit its money with the bank, and the public has a right to have its interests safeguarded through organized auditors.

And he goes on to point out that the practical difficulty is that these men who are at the head of these industrial concerns are not fitted by their training to conduct industrial enterprises successfully. He says the failure of bank management is due mainly to two reasons: First, that no man can serve two masters, and, secondly, that a man cannot at the same time do many things well.

I return to the list of directors of the Bank of Montreal. The next name is Huntley R. Drummond; he is also vice-president of the Royal Trust Company. The next name is that of D. Forbes Angus, Esquire, Montreal. I am not aware how closely he is related to R. B. Angus who was a member of the Canadian Pacific Railway group. It is strange how some of the old family names crop up. I am reminded that two generations ago in this country a fight had to be made against what was then known as the Family Compact, I am reminded that there are those in this House whose forebears took a very active part in that fight. I submit we have, in the financial oligarchy of to-day, a far more serious menace to the welfare of this country than was the Family Compact in our grandfathers' day.

The next name on the list is William McMaster, Esquire, Montreal, also a member of the Royal Trust Company, a director of the Guarantee Company of North America, the president of the Montreal Telegraph Company, a director of Penman's Limited, a director of the Belding Corticelli Company, a director of the Asbestos Corporation of Canada, the vice-president of the Dominion Glass Company, a director of the Dunlop Tire and Rubber Company, director Sherwin Williams, director Tooke Brothers, director Canadian Car and Foundry Company.

Here let me quote a further paragraph from Louis D. Brandeis:

> The compelling reason for prohibiting interlocking directorates is neither the protection of stockholders, nor the protection of the public from the incidents of inefficiency and graft. For even more important than efficiency are industrial and political liberty, and these are imperilled by the money trust.

I submit that, side by side with the governments of this country, there are growing up other rival powers that have an immense influence, and that our so-called political democracy is valueless if we allow these institutions to develop which have such a large power over the life of every man, woman and child in the country.

I go back now to the list of directors, and the next one is Lieut.-Col. Herbert Molson, C.M.G., M.C., Montreal, director of the Royal Trust Company, director Canada Paper Company, director Canadian Consolidated Rubber Company, director Goulds Manufacturing Company. The next is Harold Kennedy, Esquire, Montreal. I think he is the only one who is not a director in other companies. I have no idea at all as to whether he is devoting his attention to the work of the Bank of Montreal, or whether he is one of those who are frequently described as dummy directors, who would carry out the policies of others more powerful outside. The next is H. W. Beauclerk, Esquire, Montreal, director of the Brompton Pulp and Paper Company, a director of the Canadian Car & Foundary Company, a director of P. Lyall & Sons Construction Company. The next name is G. B. Fraser, Westmount, Quebec. Yes, here is another who is not listed in the Financial Review as a director of any other institution outside of the Bank of Montreal. The next is His Honour Henry Cockshutt, Esquire, Brantford. He is a director of the Cockshutt Plough Company. I presume when the Labour representatives a few weeks ago were accorded the honour of shaking hands with the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, they were in reality shaking hands with a director of the Bank of Montreal. No doubt His Excellency was there as representing some of these financial and industrial interests. His Honour is also a director of the National Life Assurance Company.

The next is J. H. Ashdown, Winnipeg, Manitoba, the only western name on the list. He is director of the Ashdown Hardware Company and director of the Northern Trust Company. Those of us who happen to know Winnipeg recognize very clearly that in the case of Mr. Ashdown—as I have no doubt whatever in the case of all these other men whom I have named—he is also prominent in provincial matters, in civic matters, in the board of trade and in the educational, religious and philanthropic life of the city. I am not saying this in any disparagement whatever of these men, but merely to point out that they who secure such great financial power have also a very dominating influence in every concern of the entire community.

The next name is that of E. W. Beatty, Esquire, K.C., as we all know, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am afraid that if I started in as a western member to speak of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its power it would take a very long time to exhaust what might be said on the subject. We in the West know the strength of that great corporation. I think in one of the songs which were sung by members of the Press Gallery last year there was one which went something like this:

> God save the C.P.R.
> Long to reign over us,
> Happy and glorious,
> God save the C.P.R.

Well, I am inclined to think that we have in these great corporations rival institutions that stand in power side by side with, if not superior to, those which are recognized as governmental institutions. Mr. Beatty is also a director of the Royal Trust Company.

The next name on the list is that of Sir Lomer Gouin, K.C.M.G., of Montreal, who is not only a director of the Bank of Montreal but also of the Royal Trust Company, of the Mount Royal Assurance Company, of the Mutual Life Assurance Company, of the Cockshutt Plow Company, of the Laurentide Company, of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated, of the Shawinigan Water and Power Company. I am sure that a good number of the Progressive members will feel satisfied that the interests of the West are being well looked after by the director of the Cockshutt Plow Company in the person of the Minister of Justice. A few weeks ago the member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) objected to the Mayor of Glace Bay having taken action officially in connec-

tion with some trouble there because he was a labour man. The hon. member stated that the mayor was an official in a labour union. That, I believe, is not in accordance with the facts, but it was implied by the hon. gentleman that a man connected with the labour movement could not dispassionately perform his duties as mayor. Now, if that is true, I am not quite sure how the Minister of Justice or any other member of the cabinet can adequately perform his duties when he is so closely connected with big financial and industrial corporations. Again I am saying this not in disparagement of the Minister of Justice, but merely to point out the actual conditions that exist to-day and to emphasize the need for careful consideration lest we perpetuate and aggravate these conditions. In a recent discussion respecting closed towns on the west coast the member for Skeena (Mr. Stork), I think it was, pointed out that very frequently the men were so held down that no one was even allowed to land from a boat until a company policeman standing on the gangplank had decided in his favour. I have seen standing beside the company's representative a mounted policeman, and I remember that he is responsible to the Minister of Justice. The Labour people across this country cannot forget that the Minister of Justice is also interested in paper companies and other big industrial concerns. I say this simply to drive home—

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the section under discussion is "that bank charters continue to be granted to July 1, 1933, as to some particulars," and that he is not given the same freedom in committee as when discussing the principles of a bill on the second or third reading. Rule 13, section 5, provides that:

> Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I am merely drawing this to the hon. member's attention so there will not be any danger of his wandering from the point.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I shall bear this in mind. I think I have not wandered very far. It seems to me that these remarks are very pertinent indeed when we are considering the advisability of extending the franchises to the companies represented by these very individuals.

The next name on the list is that of General Sir Arthur Currie, G.C.M.G., of Montreal. I do not think he is a director in any of the industrial companies listed, but we all know he is president of McGill University; and it is rather interesting to find that our universities also are so closely tied up with the financial interests. The trouble is that in the Canadian Financial Review we do not have the educational institutions listed, or else we would find that the universities, as also the newspapers, are more or less controlled by these same individuals.

Now that is the list of directors of the Bank of Montreal. Just a few minutes more with regard to one or two other prominent bank directors. I notice that the vice-president of the Bank of Commerce, Sir John Aird, is also a director of the British America Insurance Company, of the Imperial Life Insurance Company, of the Western Insurance Company, of the National Trust Company, of the Cockshutt Plough Company, of the Western Canada Flour Mills and of the Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company. This reminds me that in the Financial Review there do not appear foreign investments. The fact is, as brought out in the Committee on Banking and Commerce, our banks are more and more going into foreign investments, and no doubt many of these gentlemen are privately interested in these foreign concerns. I note that there is the very closest co-operation between the Canadian Bankers' Association and the American Bankers' Association. I also note, by reference to some of the English publications, that the British Empire Producers' Association has as one of its units the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Thus we see that these concerns are linked up very closely with American institutions and those of other foreign countries, and also to the big financial and industrial corporations of Great Britain.

I am not going to more than mention some of the other outstanding financial figures—Sir Thomas White, vice-president of the Bank of Commerce; Sir Joseph Flavelle, vice-president of the Bank of Commerce; Sir Herbert S. Holt, a director of some nineteen financial and industrial enterprises; Sir Augustus Nanton, a director of a large number of enterprises, including the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Winnipeg Electric Railway. I need not do more than mention the Wolvins' and J. W. Norcross, who have come to the front in connection with the investigation into lake freight rates. I need not mention American capital, which is coming from Boston into Nova Scotia and up through Detroit into western Ontario, to be used in the operation of the mines, timber limits and fisheries of northern Ontario and British Columbia—one of the more recent developments is the sale of our bonds in New York. I would note in passing that although we have

had the near failure of the Merchants Bank, those who were prominent officials and directors of that institution are still directors in important financial and industrial companies in Canada. Not only have they not been punished, but they are proceeding to carry on their work. Whether or not the near failure was owing to anything culpable or to inefficiency, the fact is that they still occupy prominent positions in financial and industrial affairs. According to the statement made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) last year in connection with some figures that he presented, sixteen corporations through interlocking directorates control over $4,000,000,000 of Canadian capital. May I quote a paragraph to show how this concentration of capital is proceeding in the United States? Mr. Roger Babson, of Babson's Statistical Service, says:

> We said that the employing class was immensely more powerful than in 1914. There is more money at its command. Eighteen thousand new millionaires are the war's legacy. This money capacity is more thoroughly unified than ever. In 1914, we had 30,000 banks functioning in a great degree in independence of each other. Then came the Federal Reserve Act and gave us the machinery for consolidation and the emergency of five years' war furnished the hammer blows to weld the structure into one.
>
> The war taught the employing class the secret and the power of widespread propaganda. Imperial Europe had been aware of this power. It was new to the United States. Now, when we have anything to sell to the American people, we know how to sell it. We have learned. We have the schools. We have the pulpit. The employing class owns the press. There is practically no important paper in the United States but is theirs.

That was published in the Grain Growers' Guide of June 30, 1920. The most serious indictment against the present banking system is summed up in a sentence by Louis D. Brandeis: "The bankers control the people through the people's own money." In this great money trust which has grown up we have, as I have pointed out, a monopoly of the collecting of deposits, a monopoly of the issuance of credits, a monopoly of the issuing of our currency. Through this means the bankers have it very largely in their power to say what shall be produced, where it shall be produced, and at what price it shall be produced. This great money trust levies tribute on everything required by the consumer. As I read that long list of directorates one could not but be impressed by the fact that these companies represented the control of almost all the commodities that were commonly in use by the people. Further than that, this great money trust, in the judgment of some of us at least, to no small extent controls the governmental machinery. Men in high government positions are men who are prominent in these banking concerns. There is at least a very close interrelation, and I think we may say assuredly that it is the same group that controls in both cases; hence the policies adopted are very largely the policies of the great money trust.

And lastly, this money trust seeks as well to dominate the educational agencies. That to me, is the most serious of all, because it means that in time we are not going to be free. I do not mean for one moment to insinuate that these moneyed men go out deliberately to buy people; I do not mean to say that they go out deliberately to threaten people. But we do know that a very large number of those in the employ of all sorts of private concerns are afraid to speak out their minds because, when they desire to carry on business they may be denied credits or otherwise be forced to succumb to the power of the financial men.

I would point out that this group resists even the most moderate reforms. I think there was not a single resolution introduced in the committee—well, possibly with the exception of one that I recall at the moment—that was generally considered to be in the interests of the people when that interest seemed to conflict with the interest of the bankers—not a single resolution of that kind that was not voted down. We were pleading for public inspection; we were pleading for the prevention of usury, for the formation of small banks, and so on; for limiting the period of charters, as we are to-day; but these moderate resolutions were resisted. How can we claim that we are doing our duty by our constituents if, in the face of their expressed dissatisfaction with the present system, in face of the widespread discussion that has gone on in the newspapers, showing that the public generally are in favour of these reforms—how can we, I say, proceed to grant charters for a ten-year period on practically the same terms on which these charters have been held in the past?

In closing, let me say just a word from the point of view of labour. Labour is not consciously and definitely interested in this question, but generally takes the attitude that all these questions belong to the capitalist, that all this is part of the present system, which they desire to see superseded. I urge however that when we touch the financial system we touch the very nerve centre of our present system. We understood its operations a little better, I think, as we observed how things were managed in the Banking and Commerce committee. I think of one little amendment that I should like to reintroduce on the floor of the House—it shows how

far this group goes—asking on behalf of the bank clerks the recognition of their right to organize for any legitimate purpose, a right guaranteed to all employed people under the Treaty of Versailles; yet even an innocent little resolution like that is voted down. It is obvious that we cannot hope to get much through this House; the most we can do is to protest. Let me say, as has been said elsewhere, that either we as a people must own and democratically control these great financial institutions, or they will absolutely own and control us.

Mr. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, several sound reasons have been advanced in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) and seconded by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). These reasons have been elaborated, and I do not propose to go over the same ground, but I do wish to register my support of the principle of the amendment, namely, that we extend the charters of the banks for one year, thus allowing further time for the consideration of the mass of evidence taken before the Banking committee. To my mind the Banking committee have done excellent work in the taking of evidence. There is a large amount of material available for the consideration of the members of the House, but unless the members have ample time to give it their considered judgment I feel that the evidence will not reach its full value to us as a parliament. Probably a great many of the members of that committee feel that they have had time to consider the evidence, but I know that a number of them do not; much less have the members of this House who were not on that committee had time to consider it. The Minister of Finance has said that the evidence has been before the country in the publications of the committee and in the press, but I do not feel that the country has had sufficient time to give it the consideration that is required. A number of letters have been received by many members of this House urging that the consideration of this act be postponed for another year. The hon. member for Red Deer has referred to the requests of the Alberta and Manitoba governments for postponement of consideration, and I think that these requests should carry considerable weight. Organized agriculture through the Canadian Council of Agriculture has also asked for a postponement of consideration, and I believe that organized labour is also of the same opinion. I think, Sir, that this weight of opinion should not be passed over lightly.

We are not in this amendment asking for anything for which there is not a precedent. I believe the same course was followed in May, 1911, and also in April, 1912. I feel that there is no sound reason why we should hurry this thing through unduly. I do not see why there is such a terrific rush to consider this act and get it out of the way. The banking system of this country is one of the most vital questions that we have to consider and I cannot help feeling that we should have further time to consider the evidence. I cannot see how any public interest will be prejudiced by a postponement of consideration of the act. I do not think that the banks themselves have anything to fear from that. We are men of reasonable judgment I think in this House, and I believe that the public interest will best be served by a postponement of consideration of the act for one year. For this reason and for the reasons that have been given by the hon. member for Red Deer I propose to support the amendment.

Mr. KELLNER: In rising to support the amendment which has been moved I desire to make a few comments on the continuation of our banking system as we now have it. I think all members will agree that conditions at the present time are very unstable. There is a good deal of dissatisfaction throughout the country at large and I think it would be a very unpopular thing to renew these bank charters as we now have them. It would almost be a proclamation that we had decided that our banking system was as good as we could hope to make it, or that we had decided that we would not go to the trouble of studying it and investigating other systems which have been proposed.

May I also call attention to the fact that at the present time marketing conditions from a world standpoint are almost an impossibility. We find many countries that are badly in need of the produce we are able to grow in Canada, but we find that their currency is so depreciated that they are unable to buy our produce. On the other hand, our banks are making a very strenuous effort to get back to the gold standard. I do not think that anything could be done that would so much retard the development of Canada as that, for if we get back to the gold standard and some of the countries to which we hope to sell have a greatly depreciated currency it would mean that those countries already debt-ridden would have to pay three and four times the ordinary price to buy what we have to sell, and we would have to take less. It is

an impossible position, and I do not think it can be continued.

There have been placed before the Banking committee three different proposals for a banking system which might give better satisfaction than the one we have at the present time. I venture to say that there is not a member of this House or a member of the Banking and Commerce committee who fully understands any one of those three systems, and surely there could be no objection to renewing these charters for another year in order to give us time to study these systems and find out if there is not a possibility at least of adapting one of them to our needs.

I would also add that in practically every country there are students at present studying the financial problem. Now if we renew our bank charters I should think it would discourage those students who are making a study of the banking system of Canada. I would almost think that they would interpret it in one of two ways: They would either say that we have a banking system and banking institutions in this country which cannot be improved upon in the opinion of this parliament, and that therefore there was little to be gained from a study of our system, or they would say that this government has taken an arbitrary stand, and therefore even if they study our system with a view to trying to improve it there would be no prospect of bringing an improved system into force.

I am also convinced that if we pass this act renewing the bank charters and the banks continue to function as they have been in the past, some of our industries will be forced to seek other sources to enable them to carry on their business. I do not know that I would be prepared to suggest what might happen in that line, but it would almost seem that they will have to devise something to take the place of money. It is possible that our agriculturists instead of selling grain will go out and sell bonds. It might be a good idea to encourage that, but I do not believe that we should actually make it necessary for them to do so by the imposition of a banking system which evidently has never met their demands at least.

I should also like to make a few remarks about the inefficiency of our present banking system, especially in regard to the banks carrying on their own business. We have very recently had what has often been referred to as the Merchants Bank catastrophe. We have seen some of the managers of that bank tried, and we have seen them whitewashed. We know that that bank lost several millions of money and the courts have proclaimed that no one was to blame. Now, if there is something the matter with our act so that when a man who has not used due discretion or honesty in handling the funds of the public cannot be convicted under it, I think we should know what it is, and I very much doubt if any member of this House does know wherein the weakness of the act in that respect lies. If it is our criminal code that is at fault, an investigation into that, which we shall probably never have if we renew these charters now for more than one year, would probably give us very valuable information.

It would be still better if an investigation were held to see if our juridical authorities might not be persuaded to at least consider the law in the light that parliament intended. Where the law is ignored entirely you have occurrences like the Merchants Bank catastrophe. If we were to go through another period of stress and some of the other banks were to get into a similar condition, I am a little afraid the managers of those banks would feel they were quite entitled to go ahead and make such disposition of the funds at their command as they saw fit; that there would be no punishment coming to them if they did so. The impression is going abroad that where a large sum of money, well up into the thousands or even into the millions of dollars, is involved there is little need for a man to fear the law; in some way or other he always seems to evade it. On the other hand it is held there is no escape for the offender if the amount lost is insignificant.

One other argument, I think, can be advanced against an extension of these bank charters for ten years, and it can be based on the statement that domination, in the end, will be eliminated. I do not believe that as matters stand we are getting very close to the elimination of that domination. I am convinced that the vast majority of the money which the banks have lent in the last few years has gone to pay interest on debts. Now, I ask you where are matters going to end if it is going to take our entire production to pay the interest on our borrowing? I do not think that anyone will argue that we can keep making fresh loans if it takes more than it is possible to raise in this country of ours to pay the interest on those loans A good deal of evidence was given before the committee on Banking and Commerce showing that many of our industries, and in particular that of agriculture, have found it impossible to pay the rate of interest which the banks claim they require in order to

be able to operate. It would seem to me, under all the circumstances, that we have reached this stage: We must either find a better banking system or we are faced with the elimination of agriculture. I believe that is one of the things we should consider very seriously before we decide to give the banks a new lease of life for ten years. Personally, I am convinced it would be much more important to the country to have a prosperous farming community, or at least have that community carrying on under decent livable conditions, than to have a dominating banking system in Canada. The present conditions, in my opinion would be greatly ameliorated if the government would only be brave for awhile and see if it were not possible to, at least, bring about a reduction in the interest we are compelled to pay. It is all very well to talk about a safe banking system, or a safe monetary system, but if that system gets "too safe" it is liable to become very weak. I think that fact was pretty well demonstrated at some of our committee meetings.

Now, the Bank Act, as I understand it, is in reality a contract between the banking institutions and the people and, I suppose, it is more or less assumed that this agreement is reasonably fair to both parties. But many hon. members will recall that there were quite a number of lobbyists operating in connection with the Banking and Commerce committee, and I think, perhaps, it is not too strong a statement to say that these lobbyists were encouraged, and probably paid for their attendance, by the banking institutions. It therefore seems scarcely possible—when one party is represented by active lobbyists, and the other party is left unrepresented—that the agreement arrived at can be absolutely fair. In conclusion I desire to say that I shall support the amendment, and that in my opinion it would be a fatal mistake to renew these charters at the present time for a longer period than one year.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BIRD: Before I proceed to the few general remarks I am about to make, I should like to pay a moment's attention to the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and I do so very deferentially because of the unfailing tolerance that the hon. gentleman always shows towards opinions that differ from his. But in his remarks he showed himself to be under some misapprehension as to our motives in taking up the time of the committee in further debating the Bank Act. I do not think we are anxious for publicity; at least we are not more anxious for it than other people are to avoid it. Our motive is pretty straightforward, and it is simply that due attention should be given to a very critical matter, I might say matters. I was referring more particularly to the one I had personally in mind. The hon. member implied that the Bank Act had already received a very thorough and searching revision, but I wish to take exception to that. The investigation into the Bank Act up to the present time has been of a rather perfunctory character with the exception of the part played by the small group representing this corner of the House. The word "revision" is almost a misnomer. What we have had has been a rather monotonous re-affirmation of the sanctity, inviolability and general unimpeachability of the Bank Act of this country.

I do not think we have had a very earnest and whole-hearted inquiry into the weaknesses and the failings, the demonstrated failings, of our present Bank Act; that in spite of the fact that in the last decade we have had one of the most unprecedented bank failures in the history of our country. The fact that we have had such a failure seems to have had very little influence upon this House. This House, or at any rate, a large section of it, is counting upon the shortness of the memory of the public. It is adopting the wisdom of the proverb that instructs us to "let sleeping dogs lie." I believe the memory of the public is short. I think it all too soon forgets the wrongs and injustices that take place from time to time. The lessons go unlearned. The people are unprofited by these things that hurt their interests, that inflict serious wounds upon the body politic. They forget them all too soon, and I am sorry to say that our statesmen and members of parliament exploit that weakness with regard to the public. I am not saying this on the strength of my own judgment, for it is well known that the press of this country, after the trials in connection with the Merchants Bank case, were clamorous for some kind of public inquiry, some efficient investigation. Those demands were widespread and unequivocal. Yet here we are almost at the end of this session; this matter has been smoothed over, passed over, and the proposition is to let it go.

I do not intend to take up the time of the committee, but I wish to make my earnest protest against this action of the House. Some one will say that attempts have been made to remedy the act so that these things

will not occur again. I want to give the Finance Minister, who is responsible for the amended act, due credit for a sincere attempt to remedy the act, so far as it can be remedied by words; but I do not think the act can be remedied in that way. One scrap of paper cannot amend another scrap of paper. The old section was just as plain, as explicit and as watertight as ingenuity could make it. You can pick out any one of the Ten Commandments, and you will find that it is not more explicit than the old section, but in spite of that fact $10,000,000 disappeared. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that an act of parliament that has a hole in it big enough to allow $10,000,000 to slip through needs, not merely to be tinkered in the gingerly fashion we have attempted to amend it, but requires a new bottom, and an overhauling through and through. I do not think we have attempted to learn from the things that have befallen us. We have been bitten once, and we are still as bold as ever. We have not only left the stable door open but it seems to me we are about to open the paddock gate too. By our passivity we are inviting a recurrence of this affair.

Just a word on another phase of this question. I imagine that the side of the Merchants Bank question that is most interesting to the public has to do with the transactions that occurred previous to the false returns that were the basis for an action in court. It was not so much the lending as the borrowing that interested the public. One paper, I remember, came out very boldly in this regard, and made the suggestion that behind the Merchants Bank case there was all the sinister evil of stock exchange gambling. I think it was the Finance Minister who assured us some time ago that there was no mystery about the Merchants Bank case. It was just bad loans—injudicious loaning. I wish to say that I think he has left out the most important phase of the question. It was not the injudicious loaning that was the important thing, but it was the judicious borrowing—the very judicious borrowing, I would say—and the public has a right to know something at any rate of the influences that so worked upon our bank officials as to make them commit the error which they committed, if you like to call it an error. I would not characterize this borrowing as being in any sense criminal, although some of the public papers went so far as to suggest that it was almost verging upon criminality. I do not want to go so far as that. It reminds me of the reproaches that Reynard, the fox, made when the cat charged him with stealing a goose. He said, "Do not say 'steal' pussy, that is not courteous or kind; but say that I obtained it through my superior ability." Well, there is a lot of that kind of acquisition going on unknown to the public, and I think the public has a right to know the methods by which people can get into the inside of our banks and get away with astounding sums of money, as they did in this case. We have heard a lot about the business acumen of our bank presidents and our bank directors; but how can they hold up their heads again before the world and claim that they are supermen in all things that pertain to sound finance when, under their very noses, people entered into their institutions and took out $10,000,000? I am sometimes amazed at the futility of the ordinary bank robber, the man who undertakes all the risk attached to an ordinary bank robbery, where he breaks into the bank in the dead of night, fully armed, ready to take all the consequences. I wonder at men being content to go on in the old-fashioned way doing these things and taking all the risk, when this other kind of thing goes on, and when men go into financial institutions and take out all this wealth, get away with it and nothing is said.

With reference to those false returns, the courts of this country—and we do not need to reflect upon their decision—said that these returns were not false, but that they were involuntarily misleading. The disappearance of all this money occurred in a fit of absence of mind. It was done without anybody being consciously blameworthy. It was not a fault or a criminal action. It was an involuntary action, misleading, it is true, but misleading in an involuntary sense. Now the public's interest in a thing of that kind is clear. It does not matter to the public whether it was voluntary or involuntary. It is dangerous just the same. It makes no difference whether it was done wilfully or not, the same amount of money is missing. And this is what we are concerned about. It seems to me that the only way of preventing a recurrence of such a scandal is for parliament to see to it that in future the government make its own returns. I am not going to enter into all the threadbare arguments against outside inspection—arguments which appeal only to those who represent our big financial interests and who are jealous of having their privileges inquired into. The view taken by the average man in the street is that the government should be able to make certain that this sort of thing does not go on in our banks. The evidence before the courts showed that two government officials after only two days' inspection of the books of the

Merchants Bank discovered that millions of dollars were missing. We are not asking for any elaborate inspection and audit, we are not asking that all the petty accounts of the myriad branches should be investigated. We are simply asking that an efficient man in the pay of the government should have the right to scan the ledgers at the main offices of these banks and at their more important branches and so ascertain the actual condition of affairs. Common sense would dictate that such a man, almost by a single glance, could tell if there was serious mismanagement. I think that is what the public expects and what it would demand if this question could only be kept before the public mind, for, as I said before, the public has a knack of forgetting these important things and waiting until the next financial disaster occurs before rousing itself to renewed action.

Now, a word in regard to the merger of the Merchants Bank with the Bank of Montreal. In announcing this merger the Minister of Finance regretted the trend of the concentration of financial control in a few hands, and yet he saw no alternative but to impose this merger upon the country. He proposed to cure one evil by inflicting another. Our banking system had been affected, so to speak, with scarlet fever, and he straightway inoculated it with typhoid in the hope of eradicating the first disease. He stated that we were passing through serious times, that the public mind is fickle, and therefore we must not hesitate or delay but must plunge into this recognized evil in order to escape another. Some of our newspapers strongly criticized—not the action of the Minister of Finance, but the action that instigated the merger, and one prominent journal called it a cowardly action not justified by the circumstances.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Minister of Finance—and he is about the only spokesman for the forces of hurry in this House; there are not very many others who are bold enough to stand up and plead for rushing the Bank Act through—I do not think the minister advances any other argument but that of stability. And to stabilize has become characteristic of him. We know that he has stabilized our tariff. Now he proposes to stabilize our financial system.

We have seen a very significant combination of forces brought about in this House to prevent us in this quarter securing what we consider to be a very reasonable delay in the revision of the act. It is said that trouble makes strange bed-fellows. Well, sometimes even the unfounded anticipation of trouble has the same effect. We have had the spectacle of Liberal members joining hands with Conservative members in trying to thwart the very reasonable desires of the Progressive party. The other night I saw what I thought was the extreme of incompatibility —a lion riding on the back of a mule; but during the progress of this act through parliament we have seen an equally strange sight—the Conservative party in an "unholy alliance" with the Liberal party in an attempt to block free discussion of the Bank Act.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is a shame.

Mr. BIRD: The trouble is you do not feel the shame. To me it is strange how enthusiasms evaporate in this House. Last session when the Progressives were not saying very much about inadequate discussion of the Bank Act, we had some very eloquent speeches from the Conservative side urging a thorough discussion of the act in view of the Merchants Bank fiasco, and the House will pardon me for reading at length a few extracts from last year's Hansard because I know hon. members will find them very interesting. At that time a prominent member on the Conservative side said:

> Let me turn to another subject that has not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I refer to the Bank Act. I understand that next year is really the time for the amendment of that act. I was of the opinion that it should have been amended this year to conform with the practice of the past, but in that perhaps I am mistaken. Whether that be the case or not, however, I think that the Banking and Commerce committee might very properly make a careful examination this year into the workings of the Bank Act, that is to say, into some of its evident weaknesses. I am not one of those who subscribe to the statement that our banking system has not proven workable, or that it is an unsuccessful system which is not in the best interests of the people. I am not ready to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) made this afternoon—statements which seemed to me with great facility and despatch to dispose of this great problem with a complacency that one might well envy, if, indeed, the remarks of the hon. gentleman could bring about a solution of the problem. I believe that our banking system is, in the main, a sound one; it is one of the best systems in the world. Nevertheless, we have to consider the incident of the Merchants Bank during the past few months to realize that there are weaknesses, or, shall I say, loopholes in the Bank Act, and that it is necessary, if not to reconstruct, at least to amend it, so as to render impossible a recurrence of the failure of the Merchants Bank.

And the word "failure" is not mine.

> Perhaps that word is too strong; at all events, let me say the incident of the Merchants Bank. For instance, the Merchants Bank directorate or management must have made false returns to the Department of Finance for several months before the crash came. I do not see how the returns that they did make could approach accuracy in view of the sudden collapse, or partial collapse that confronted us. If it

is true, as I surmise—and I think the evidence strongly supports the assumption—that the bank made false returns, then this parliament ought to know it, and I believe that the Banking and Commerce committee should summon before it the management, the president and any other officials of the Merchants Bank who might throw light on the matter, in order that parliament might be fully seized of all the steps which led up to this very regrettable incident in the banking life of this country. Furthermore, the Banking committee could very well make this examination for the purpose of preparing amendments to the Bank Act, when it comes up for general revision next year.

Mr. GOOD: Whose speech is my hon. friend quoting from?

Mr. BIRD: The hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), I think. I might supplement that by a quotation from another hon. member on the Conservative side of the House, just to show that we on this side are not doing anything at the present time that need be taken as unwonted or extraordinary; we are taking an attitude which was taken by others last session. Another hon. member said:

In conclusion, I want to refer to three or four other matters which I think should be mentioned in this debate, because this is the only opportunity we have of doing so under the rules of the House.

This is the utterance of a member for Toronto—one of the greatest financial centres in Canada—who was specially interested in this subject.

If there ever was in this country an act that needed overhauling, it is the much-heralded Bank Act. Some newspapers are beginning to wonder whether there is to be one law for the rich and another for the poor in this country.

I think it is necessary for me to say again that this is the utterance of a Conservative member, otherwise the committee might think I was quoting from the speech of one of the representatives of labour.

I have read, in some very reputable newspapers, in Canada, articles referring to some people who stole $8,000 out of a bank, and some other poor fellow who took $1.25 out of a postal envelope. The people who stole $8,000 got a life sentence because they robbed the bank with violence; the poor postman, on a small salary without bonus, who took $1.25 out of an envelope, was sent down. This matter of the Merchants Bank should not be left to any superior or high court judge of the province of Quebec; or the Appellate division either; there should be an independent inquiry by the High Court of parliament and no whitewash. We should find out whether we have a Bank Act, whether it is a mere scrap of paper or not, and whether the monthly returns made by the bank to the minister are scraps of paper or not. I believe the losses will run to twelve or thirteen million dollars before they get through. What protection has the investor, the stockholder? I know one man in my city who has started to sell out every dollar's worth of stock he has in some small banks. When I asked him the reason, he said that he was very doubtful if, in some of the smaller banks, the shareholders have the protection which they should have. This parliament should be big enough to go into the whole question of the Merchants Bank. The banks have been allowed to increase their note circulation; they have been given many special privileges, and a thorough inquiry should be made into the whole matter. The House and the country expect us to do our duty in this matter. Where do the Progressives stand upon it?

[Mr. Bird.]

I notice that the hon. gentleman is not in the House to-night to say where he stands.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Whose speech was that?

Mr. BIRD: I have difficulty in remembering where these hon. gentlemen come from; that was the hon. member for North Toronto, I believe. Well, why has this enthusiasm evaporated to such an extent that the battle is left entirely to us? I can understand why hon. members on the other side have not expressed themselves, but I cannot understand why the enthusiasts to my right should have dropped this matter and left us to wage the fight alone. Now,—

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend permit me? He has quoted at some length from a speech I made last year. May I point out to him and to the committee that that speech was delivered before the prosecutions were launched against the officials of the Merchants Bank, and it was with the distinct understanding that these prosecutions were going on that I dropped a motion that I put on the order paper last year. Any further discussion would have done a grave injustice to those who were being prosecuted in the criminal courts of the country. If, as is common to a committee of parliament, evidence were brought forward in a loose manner while this case was pending, the parties would hardly have a fair chance in the courts; accordingly, this matter was not proceeded with last year. The prosecution having been held and a very complete threshing out of the whole problem having taken place, the needs presented there do not stand this year as they did at that time before any prosecutions were commenced.

Mr. BIRD: The hon. gentleman's explanation is all right but I think he must have been aware that the prosecution was pending while he uttered those words.

Mr. STEVENS: It had not been launched; and the Minister of Finance if he were in his seat, would bear me out, I am quite sure. It was subsequent to that speech and subsequent to the placing on the order paper of a resolution to refer the whole question to the Banking and Commerce committee that the knowledge, even the preliminary intimation, that the prosecutions would be launched was brought to my attention.

Mr. BIRD: My point is that the hon. gentleman must have known that this thing was going to the courts.

Mr. STEVENS: I beg to correct my hon. friend; I have done so once. I knew absolutely nothing about it until it was conveyed to me subsequent to both the speech and the placing of the resolution on the order paper. I consented to let the resolution stand for the reasons I have mentioned.

Mr. BIRD: Well, I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's word in regard to his lack of knowledge, but in regard to the prospective action in the courts, if my memory is correct the knowledge was pretty well diffused throughout the country that the Finance Minister had decided that this thing should be investigated in the courts. However—

Mr. STEVENS: I must correct my hon. friend. I cannot allow him indirectly to impute lack of accuracy to my statement. What I say is this, and I state it again most positively; that the prosecutions were not launched, there were no intimations to the public that they were to be launched, until subsequent to both the speech and the resolution going on the order paper. If the Minister of Finance were in his seat I would appeal to him for permission to make a statement that would prove that beyond peradventure. I ask my hon. friend not to impute inaccurate statements to me, even indirectly.

Mr. BIRD: I assure my hon. friend that I have no intention of doing that. But I quoted from his speech in good faith rather to show his enthusiasm in the matter last session, and I think that part of his speech shows that he had great enthusiasm. The point of his interruption is valuable only if the action in the courts fulfilled the earnest desire he expressed in that speech and I think it will be very hard for him to contend that it did.

Now, I want to refer again to the course which the Minister of Finance has taken. I wish to make the charge of inconsistency against the Finance Minister with as light a hand as I possibly can, but in the light of his actions when the revision of the Bank Act was up some ten or twelve years ago I think it will be difficult for him to escape that imputation at least to some slight extent. The revision of the Bank Act was up before this House in the sessions of 1909 and 1910, when our present Minister of Finance occupied that same office. Early in the session in answer to Mr. Borden, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said with respect to the Bank Act revision, "This matter was very well advanced," and would be presented "early this session."

Later in answer to a question he said, "It is contemplated to provide a Bank Act this session." On February 14 of the same session, in reply to Mr. Foster, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said that he was bringing forward an act which "would not be much longer delayed." In reply to Mr. Foster later on he said that the act was in an advanced condition but that all would depend on other business. If the session was protracted, it would be that session; if not, the next session. Towards the end of the session, in reply to Mr. Emmerson, he said that there would not be sufficient time that session. The next year the opposition got very clamorous and the bill was introduced on December 15, 1910, in the early part of the session, but was not proceeded with until March 31 the following spring, when Mr. Lennox asked for action. The contention of Mr. Lennox was that some very serious bank failures had taken place during the decade. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) replied:

> If circumstances make it necessary to bring in a temporary bill carrying the banks over for another year, I think no harm would be done. A little further time will not be to the disadvantage of any interest concerned. . . . I do not think that any great public interest will suffer.

Mr. Foster also urged strongly that the government proceed with the bill. On April 4, 1911, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) further put off the matter, and on May 11 of that year he announced that a bill would be introduced for extension of the bank charters for one year. But they were not fated to proceed with the bill, for the next session found others in possession, and in the Hansard of that next session I find that the new government adopted the same delaying tactics. Mr. Lemieux early in the session inquired whether action would be taken that session, and Mr. Borden replied that it was simply a matter of time. Later on Mr. Macdonald also inquired, and he too was put off. So I think that the House cannot claim that this group on this side of the House is asking for anything that is unprecedented. We are asking for a course that was pursued at the last revision of the Bank Act, and the delay that we are asking is only for one session, and for a very good reason. On that former occasion the revision was delayed from session to session without any good reason except the urgency of other business. Now as a young member of this House, as a politician very much in the green, I find we have to go back

at least ten years in the lives of our prominent public men to find out what is proper to do to-day. We find out what they did about ten years ago, and then we go and do the opposite and we get the unanimous approval of this House. I wish to put that on record, not to charge the Finance Minister with any grave inconsistency because he may have justified himself, he surely will have justified himself in his own mind for the transformation of his conduct between now and then, and again I want to allude to the distinct courtesy and tolerance of the Minister of Finance as exercised towards us as we have endeavoured in our inexperienced way to put these objections of ours before him. The hon. minister kicks us downstairs with such infinite grace that you might think he was helping us up, and I for one have no objection to the way in which he has met our objections. I am sorry he should be such a lone mouthpiece in this unjustifiable policy of rush and hurry. I am sorry there are not more articulate exponents of that mystical doctrine of "get this thing through as quick as you can," for no ascertainable reason. I think it is very significant that he should be left alone to bear the burden of this contention.

I want to say in concluding that although we may have gone about this thing in a somewhat unrestrained manner at times, yet we have been acting in good faith and with the belief that we were carrying out the dictates of public opinion, and I believe that public opinion will sustain us in the action we have taken. I think it will be very hard for both the other parties to explain to the public why they carried this thing through as they have done against the reiterated protests from the group on this side of the House.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest not so much against the Bank Act, for I was not a member of the Banking and Commerce committee, but for the purpose of protesting against extending without further consideration the bank charters for another ten years. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have mentioned the muddle into which the Merchants Bank got, and most of us here, particularly those from the province of Ontario, will remember that it was only a few years before that the Farmers Bank failed, and I really believe that that bank was in a bigger muddle than the Merchants Bank. Some of the managers of that institution although they had condemned themselves were let go by the courts. One of them skipped out of this country just as soon as the failure took place and was hounded round and found at last in the city of Chicago, I believe. He was brought back to this country and haled before the courts, and a verdict of not guilty was brought in about one minute before the man passed into the other world, and no man in this House or any other house can make me believe that he was not guilty.

The same kind of thing took place in connection with the Merchants Bank, and I rise to protest against extending the charters of these banks for another ten years until those men are brought before the bar of this House. My hon. friend from Nelson has covered the case of the Merchants Bank pretty fully, and I shall detain the House only for a few minutes to ask the Minister of Finance if he thinks the people of this country are going to stand for seeing millions of dollars squandered by these institutions and the men responsible let go scot-free. Do the bankers of Canada think they have special privileges entitling them to squander that money? Let me cite a few of the items showing the manner in which the money has been squandered. Loans to the extent of two millions were made to the officers of the bank for the purchase of automobiles and fancy homes. Little of this money came back. Advances to the total of four and a half millions were made to one stock broking firm that engaged in gambling and exploitation, and only $500,000 of it came back. To protect a debt owed by one of the manufacturing firms amounting to $65,000 a total of $1,300.000 was advanced and $1,000,000 was lost. This accounts for probably only one-half of the total amount that was squandered, I do not think I am using too strong a term when I say "squandered." The details of the other half are probably even more shocking than the ones I have mentioned, but I do not see any advantage in enumerating any more of them and occupying the time of the House unduly. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to enter my protest against making such advances. As I have not studied the Bank Act, not being a member of the committee, I shall merely enter my protest on that phase of the subject and leave the matter there.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to make just one observation as to the point raised by the hon. member for Nelson. He drew the attention of the House to a statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) last year in which he distinctly recommended that some of the officers of the late Merchants Bank should have been brought before the House, or before one of its committees, to give information. When

this fact was brought to his attention by the hon. member (Mr. Bird) he defended himself on the ground that at that time the prosecution had not been taken. Subsequently it was undertaken and therefore he sees no reason to make the same request this year. Now, I want to submit to him, and to the House, that the information which was elicited during the trial is entirely irrelevant to the purposes for which we would wish to have that information in this House. Therefore, I contend that the defence which my hon. friend put in is entirely outside the point. The information that we wish to get is not that connected with the particular indictments brought at the trial, it is information of a very much wider character. I consider the defence of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in that respect is very weak, and I am sorry that he has not joined with us this year in renewing the demand that he made last year.

Mr. BANCROFT: As one of the western representatives I want to take this opportunity of placing myself on record in favour of the amendment. A very significant feature in connection with the consideration of the Bank Act this year, was the fact that thousands of representative citizens throughout the country were consulted by letter and asked for their opinions as to the revision of the act. The replies received would indicate that people throughout Canada believe there is a direct relationship between the credit system or the banking system of this country and the recovery of the agricultural industry. I think it is only fair to Canadian agriculturists to state that they have put forth almost superhuman efforts in an endeavour to solve this problem, apart from federal aid. In this regard it is well to remember what has been done in several provinces of Canada. Farm loans, rural credits, and provincial banks have been established in an effort to meet the situation and, as far as western Canada is concerned, have proved inadequate only because of the limit of capital at the disposal of these institutions. It is owing to the fact that the people have realized their limitations in this respect that they now appeal to the federal government to come to their assistance. And Mr. Chairman, even though a more adequate system cannot be evolved in the immediate future a free and frank discussion of the whole situation would tend to allay suspicion, and would also tend to strengthen the hands of the banks themselves. It would restore the confidence of the people in the banks, and great institutions such as these cannot be carried on successfully for any length of time unless they enjoy the confidence of the people. For the reasons I have given I intend to support the amendment.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I wish to say a word or two with respect to the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen since the committee commenced the consideration of the bill. It is not necessary for hon. gentlemen opposite to defend their motives in criticizing the measure. I am sure ample opportunity will be given to every hon. gentleman to make any observations he desires on the bill, or to suggest any amendment which he wishes between now and the time the measure will come from the committee. I do say however that when hon. gentlemen undertake to say that the revision of the Bank Act should not have been proceeded with they should give reasons for that statement, and the reasons should be substantial, they should be reasoned, and they should be based upon something, whether that something is strong, weak, or indifferent. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon have not, in my judgment, given reasons for a delay in the revision of the Bank Act.

One hon. member, just a moment ago, referred to the fact that in 1911 a bill for the revision of the Bank Act was introduced and was deferred. Hon. gentlemen need only to recall the political incidents of that year to appreciate what happened. It was the session of parliament in which the Reciprocity treaty with the United States came before the country as a political issue. The session of parliament closed rather hurriedly, and the whole country was engaged in a political contest over that particular issue. The government of the day was defeated and in 1912 the new ministry asked for a delay in the matter of the revision of the Bank Act. That was quite natural because the new government, with the many duties which constitutionally devolved upon them, would expect the country to justify them in asking for an extension of time. Accordingly, in 1912 an act was passed extending the term of the Bank Act. The reason for not proceeding with the revision of the Bank Act then was a very good reason, and it proved satisfactory to the country at the time.

9 p.m.

Hon. gentlemen say that many demands have been made for delay in the revision of the Bank Act during the present session. I heard it said this afternoon that there was a body of men in my own province of Nova Scotia favourable to delaying the revision of the act. I venture to say that if you can-

vassed the entire population of the provinces you would have difficulty in finding twenty-one out of the whole half million who had so expressed themselves. I believe a resolution was passed at some farmers' convention. I had the privilege of inquiring of two prominent persons who were present at that convention and they could not even recall that it was considered. That resolution must have come before the convention in the most informal and perfunctory manner.

Mr. DUFF: There were only fifteen there anyway.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friend from Lunenburg suggests that there were only fifteen present, but I think there were more. But I venture to say that in the Maritime provinces there was no body of public opinion favourable to a postponement of the revision of the Bank Act. They desire reasonable, fair and proper amendments to it, of course, as do the people of every other section of Canada. There is no reason for asking for a delay in parliament doing its duty, namely extending the bank charters of this country when such charters expire at the end of the decennial period. The duty rests upon parliament and upon every hon. member to extend those charters, and they should be extended except for some strong, substantial reasons which as yet have not been given to parliament, nor to the Banking and Commerce committee. Again I venture to give as a reason why parliament should insist upon the renewal of the charters at the present time, the fact that the whole banking system has been challenged and foolish, dangerous substitutes have been suggested. I think it is wise that parliament and the country should express their disapproval of those suggestions. Hon. members say that we are rushing this bill through parliament.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): An hon. member opposite in very subdued tones says "hear, hear," and I fancy that the tone in which that interjection was uttered is an indication that he did not feel very strongly in that direction himself. So far as I know, no effort on the part of the government, or of the committee, or of any hon. member has been made to rush this bill through the House. It was a long while in the committee. The Bank Act itself was well considered, and before it went to the committee it has had the consideration of the Department of Finance. Important amendments appeared in the bill before it went to the committee, and the House approved the bill as amended before it was sent to the committee. It was considered in the committee, section by section, and clause by clause, and no very important amendments were suggested by any hon. members opposite. I commend them for their energy and the attention they gave to the bill while it was being considered by the committee, but I say in all frankness and kindliness that they did not propose any amendment of a substantial nature to the bill. It is true that other important questions came up; but as regards the Bank Act itself, members of the Progressive party who were members of the Banking committee, made no very serious and important suggestions, and if amendments of that character were made, the committee gave ample and due consideration to them. How long do hon. members think a bill of this character should be considered in parliament or in committee? Are we going to sit month after month, year after year, decade after decade? How long is it going to take hon. members to make up their minds as to what a bill means, and what their decision will be about the matter? We would have no laws anywhere if hon. members engaged in legislative halls were to say: "You must not rush; we must have time to consider." Everybody, I think, has had ample opportunity to make any suggestion and to propose any amendment that was of any value.

We have in Canada a banking system which has been in existence since confederation and which is known as the branch bank system I think it has functioned well and successfully in this country. Like everything else it may have its weak points, and it is our duty as parliamentarians to eradicate those weak features if we can put our fingers upon them. But we must have a Bank Act, because if we did not have some banking system under the authorization of the statutes of our country, commerce and trade could not be carried on and everything in this country would stop. I think, speaking generally, every hon. member feels that our banking system on the whole is a pretty sound system, and that it has operated pretty well in the past. It stood the strain of the war test as well as any other banking system in the world. I think our bank managers and directors deserve credit for the management of Canadian banks during the war period, and it should be said of them, that they came through that ordeal in as good shape as did banks of any other country in the world.

Hon. members have referred to the Merchants Bank failure, and they spoke of money having been lost. They talk as if by some act of parliament, the recurrence of such a

thing should be prevented. Bank failures cannot be prevented by legislation any more than the commission of crime can be prevented by criminal laws. Even the Ten Commandments to which one hon. member referred this evening are violated though they came to the sons of men amid the lightnings and thunders of Mount Sinai. It is perfect nonsense to think that you can eliminate human weakness, errors in human judgment, by acts of parliament. Of course we must do everything we possibly can to prevent bank failures in the future, but I do not hesitate to say that they will occur in the future. After all a bank is in essence no different from a cross-roads country grocery store. The country store sells general groceries, or something or another, and the bank merchandisers' credit. There is quite a contrast, it is true, as to the exact character of the businesses, but after all each buys and sells something. As long as human nature is what it is, we shall have failures at the country cross-roads store and in banks in Canada. To say that because the Merchants Bank of Canada failed, we should delay re-enactment of Canadian bank charters, is reasoning that I cannot understand.

Mr. FIELDING: The Merchants Bank did not fail.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Minister of Finance reminds me, and it is true, that the Merchants Bank of Canada did not fail. They decided to go out of business, as many concerns and corporations are deciding to do to-day and will to-morrow in these distressing days in commercial life the world over. The Merchants Bank extended their loans too freely. Somebody made a mistake; the management made mistakes, and in my judgment some of their mistakes are not very easily condoned.

Mr. IRVINE: Will the hon. member say whether he knows or does not know why the Merchants Bank failed?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Because in the course of business they lost a certain amount of their assets by weak loans. They became weak, just in the same manner as ordinary business concerns become weak and fail.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the hon. member admit that they failed?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is not much use in discussing that. I said a moment ago that they did not fail, and as a matter of fact and of law, they did not fail. The noteholders were paid. The depositors were paid. The shareholders possibly suffered a loss in the value of their shares, but by their vote they agreed to the sale of the assets of the bank. The Department of Finance instituted criminal proceedings against two officers of that bank. After trial in the courts of the province of Quebec these men were acquitted. What more could be done? How ineffective it would be to have an investigation in the Banking and Commerce committee. Would there be any tribunal as ill-fitted in all Canada as parliament to investigate a failure of that kind? We have had bank failures in the past and the country was satisfied with the public inquiry or the investigations in the courts concerning these particular failures. I think in connection with some of the bank failures preceding that of the Merchants Bank some bank managers went to penitentiary. That did not happen in the case of the failure of the Merchants Bank. But I ask hon. members, what more could be done, and why is it made the basis for the suggestion that we should postpone the further consideration of the Bank Act.

I said a moment ago that very important amendments had been made to this act, and I particularly refer to the new clauses in respect of the shareholders' audit, and to the provisions which require the shareholders' auditors to bring to the knowledge of the directors all the facts which should come before them in connection with the business of the bank. The latter I regard as an important amendment, for if by any audit system you can bring to the attention of the directors the important facts in connection with the business affairs of an institution, particularly its weak and doubtful points, I think you have gone just about as far as you can go in the way of legislation to give security to depositors and shareholders. But if these amendments are not sufficient, further amendments can be made upon the suggestion of any hon. member, and that is our business here while the bill is before the committee.

Reference has been made to the financial conditions of the country, and it is said the present banking system is not of a character to meet effectually the present situation. Many hon. gentlemen in this House fail to distinguish between banking institutions and credit institutions. It was felt by many hon. members in the committee, and I think in the House, that there was possibly a field for some financial institution operating between the banks and mortgage corporations which might be filled by some financial institution, call it what you will. We generally refer to them as rural credit associations. This particular form of credit is being tried in the

United States to-day. In Europe we find they usually operate under the name of some co-operative association, and splendid things have been done there, and I do hope that some day soon we may have them in Canada. The conditions in western Canada, I admit, are deplorable. Therefore, the minds of many hon. members opposite belonging to the Progressive party are centred upon the conditions prevailing in their own particular section of Canada. We all appreciate that. In some sections of the province of Alberta, where they have had a failure in crops for three years, the conditions are particularly distressing, but that is not due to any economic law or any weakness in the banking institutions of this country. Nobody on earth is to blame for that condition, and if blame is to be attached, hon. gentlemen opposite will have to go into another sphere to find who is to blame. The chief difficulty in the western country to-day is that many farmers overborrow. That is admitted. That has been admitted by pretty nearly every hon. member from the western provinces who took part in the deliberations of the committee on Banking and Commerce. I understand this admission was made frequently by western men before another committee. The real problem in the western provinces to-day—at least in one of them, and possibly in two of them—is to devise some scheme by which the present indebtedness to banks, to mortgage corporations, to merchants and others could be lifted from the shoulders of the people and spread over a long period of years. That probably concerns the farmers of the West more to-day than the question of rural credits for the future. The member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) said to-day that several schemes were presented before the Banking committee which are not to be found here. Well, there were some schemes presented to the Banking and Commerce committee, and some of them were very fantastic.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the hon. member think it is fair for him to make a lot of statements about what was presented in committee, but were never considered in committee? He is only offering his opinion, which is as good as anybody else's, but no better. He is not speaking for the committee in that regard. The committee came to no conclusion on that question.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why did the hon. gentleman not make his remarks to the hon. member behind him (Mr. Bird) when he was stating to the committee that these suggestions were not incorporated in the bill, and urging that as a ground for delaying the consideration of the bill?

Mr. IRVINE: If the hon. member who spoke on this side of the House made a mistake in referring to them, does the hon. gentleman think he is doing any better by making these statements concerning matters which were never considered in committee?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think I have made any mistake in the statements I have made, and I am not apologizing to the hon. gentleman at all. I was perfectly within my right in making the remarks I did.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. member has not answered my question.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not propose to discuss the schemes of Mr. Douglas, or Mr. Bevington, or Mr. Fisher, because this is not an opportune time. I think the opportunity will come later. A great many other remarks have been made since this bill was taken up by the committee this afternoon. I thought it desirable to make a few observations regarding some of the criticisms which were made, but I do wish to say that I think, if hon. gentlemen are serious in urging a postponement of the consideration of this bill and its enactment, really some more substantial reasons should be given. I am not objecting to the discussion or criticism. I have been merely attempting to answer some of the criticisms, and I trust the committee will soon see fit to proceed with the bill.

Mr. HOEY: Mr. Chairman, I was not a member of the Banking committee, nor did I attend the sessions of that committee with the regularity that would entitle me to pose as an authority on the subject matter in the discussion of which we are now engaged. However, there is an impression in my mind that the revision of the Bank Act this year received consideration equal to, if not greater than, the consideration accorded any previous revision. The members of the Banking committee met regularly, worked strenuously, and I think the House as a whole is indebted to them for what they have already accomplished.

And yet it seems to me that the demand embodied in the amendment is reasonable—a demand supported by several representative organizations throughout the country, a demand made upon myself by at least twenty or thirty correspondents who have written to me from various sections of the Dominion.

If we penetrate beneath the surface of things in an attempt to answer the question put by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), I think we will discover that this demand is based, first of all, upon a growing tendency in the minds of the Canadian people to-day that our electoral system—that is, the mere mechanical process of holding an election—does not place at the disposal of the people in parliament a sufficient number of specialists to undertake to pass upon a subject so technical, so involved, so abstruse and so far-reaching in its effects as the revision of the Bank Act undoubtedly is. Not only do they lack faith in the ability of their elected representatives, but they are frequently reminded of the limited time at our disposal to undertake and carry to a successful conclusion this Herculean task.

But the senior member for Halifax will remind me that on this occasion specialists were summoned, authorities on banking were brought before the committee and gave evidence, which evidence has been published verbatim. I want to be honest with myself and with hon. members. How many members of the Banking committee have read through that evidence? And of those who have read it through how many fully understand it? But in the last analysis it is not the members of the Banking committee before whom that evidence was taken who are going to be responsible for passing this legislation, it is the hon. members of this Chamber; and again I want to be honest with myself and with hon. members. How many members of this Chamber have read that evidence through? And of those who have done so how many fully understand it? How many could get up here, or before a public audience, and give an intelligent lecture of one hour's duration on the evidence submitted? Has the Prime Minister read that evidence? Doubtless the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has. But, if so, is it not a reasonable request to make of him that he present to this House a brief synopsis of the evidence, showing that in the light of the knowledge that has come to us from the evidence the present measure is the best possible act that can be evolved in the next decade? Again I say, if we penetrate beneath the surface we find that while the people may have faith in the honesty of their elected representatives, they have grave doubts as to their specialized knowledge. That is to say, Democracy's ability to return members to parliament at this time has outdistanced Democracy's ability to discover and return to parliament the right type of man. Hence we have to-day the demand for government by commission. We have a Railway Commission. We have a Civil Service Commission. We have a Board of Grain Commissioners. Last year we had a Royal Commission on Pensions and this year a royal commission inquiring into lake freight rates. I do not know but what the time is rapidly approaching when we shall, in response to this growing demand, have to appoint a commission on banking—a commission on finance. Now, I say to the senior member for Halifax—and I say it in all kindness—that in my humble judgment no government, if it is wise, can afford to treat with impunity and with contempt such tendencies on the part of the people they are seeking to govern. A wise government, a government that is well advised, will take note of such tendencies and attempt to reconcile them with the theory of responsible government.

Turning to the banks for a moment, it would be too much for us to expect that our banking institutions could escape from the storm of criticism, the force of which has been felt by almost every institution within the circle of our national life. The fact that there has been a tendency towards the centralization of financial control, coupled with the fact that our banks have been paying dividends on a normal basis during a period of the most acute financial stringency in Canadian history, has created an impression in the minds of many people that these institutions enjoy advantages and privileges not enjoyed by other institutions in this country.

Then I want to say that this demand is inseparably bound up with the demand for a rural credit scheme. Some scheme or proposal for an extension of rural credits is, in my judgment, indispensably essential if we are to stimulate production in the western sections of this country, which production when stimulated will enable us to meet our financial obligations. Representations have been made to the hon. Minister of Finance with regard to a commission on taxation; it is proposed to hold a conference to which will be invited all the provincial treasurers. It seems to me that that would be an opportune time not only to discuss taxation, it would be an opportune time to discuss the whole problem of rural credit, the funding of farmers' obligations and a thousand and one questions related to that subject. What could be more appropriate than that the present Minister of Finance, after years of service, after his splendid devotion to the cause of duty in this country—what could be more fitting, than

that he, in co-operation with those who are willing to assist him, should in the immediate future evolve some system of rural credit, not a slavish imitation of systems already existing in other countries, but something new, something original, something worthy of Canadian statesmanship, something that will meet our present needs?

So much for the mere economic aspects of the question. When the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) suggests that we are opposed to this bill, he is, not deliberately but unintentionally, misrepresenting our position. We are prepared to support this bill for at least a year, but we are not prepared to support it for a period of ten years, with the information at our disposal. Then, there are other considerations, the least worthy of all—what I would call political considerations. It would scarcely be fair to say that the demand for this postponement comes wholly from western Canada, but I think it is the case that the demand is more pronounced in western Canada, because of the peculiar economic conditions prevailing there. As I listened to the speeches this afternoon I thought of the effect those speeches would have upon the present government.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is the hon. gentleman worrying much about it?

Mr. HOEY: I am not worrying at all. But I wondered if those speeches, broadcasted from one end of this country to the other, would have the effect of rousing the Canadian people and sending thousands to the polls who up to the present have refused to vote. If I thought such speeches had that effect, I would encourage them, but I am inclined to think, and I say it in all seriousness, that utterances of this kind will have a tendency to embitter the Canadian people, to set class against class, to set one section of the country against the other, and to undermine the faith of the Canadian people—that is, the little bit of faith they have left—in political institutions as they exist. I am not persuaded that the present leader of the government has decided to scrap western Canada so far as his future political plans and ambitions are concerned. A gentleman told me to-day he was convinced that the present Prime Minister had pulled down the curtain so far as western Canada was concerned. I am rather inclined to think that the Prime Minister—and I have considerable faith in his sincerity; I wish I had the same faith in his political sagacity—is still willing to make an attempt to unite the different sections that go to constitute the Canadian nation. I do not believe that the Prime Minister extracts pleasure from the division that at present exists. But what are the facts? I should be out of order here if I referred to a budget for the creation of which and for the adoption of which the present administration was responsible this year, but I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that that budget, for weal or for woe, caused dismay in the minds of the government's most loyal and devoted followers in the western section of this country. And then they come along with a proposal, the psychological effects of which are going to be tremendous, a proposal and an attitude on the part of the government which if persisted in, and coupled with the speeches that are going to be made, will definitely line the present administration up with the eastern interests. But the Prime Minister says: We have taken a certain position, and we cannot, and maintain our dignity, give way to an irresponsible minority in this House. But I want to remind the present government that if they do not seriously consider the advisability of giving way to a so-called irresponsible minority in this House they are going to be accused of lining up with an irresponsible minority outside this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my friend quoting me when he uses the expression that he has just employed?

Mr. HOEY: I think the Prime Minister misunderstood me. I have not quoted him to-night. I was speaking rhetorically when I said: The present government may say that it cannot, and maintain its dignity, give way to an irresponsible minority in this House. I can only say that if the government do not seriously consider the advisability of giving way to a so-called irresponsible minority in this House they will be accused, they are being accused now, of being dominated by an irresponsible minority outside this House, namely, the eastern interests. If I were interested in the triumph of mere political parties—and I do not give a continental for the growth or triumph of any party—I would not ask for a better basis upon which to build up the party to which I am attached than the present attitude of the government on the revision of the Bank Act. I do not mean to say that it is a great thing in itself; there is a lot of merit in the argument of the hon. member for Halifax. But if you exercise your imagination and think that men in the paralyzing grip of economic necessity to-day are willing to blame almost anybody in the present crisis—exercise your imagination in that sense, and then think of the future political result.

I am interested in the attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) on this question; I will await his speech with considerable interest. He has much less political sagacity than I give him credit for if he supports the government in putting through for a ten year period this Bank Act, in view of the state of public opinion throughout the country. I have tried to be fair in my remarks; I have tried to be conciliatory; I have no desire to stir up bitterness or to awaken hatreds. I simply submit these considerations to the government for what they are worth, and I wonder if even yet some compromise could not be reached that would be satisfactory to all concerned, some compromise that would awaken hope in rural Canada that the present administration is at least making an honest, a sincere, a supreme attempt to come to their rescue and to help them out of their present difficulties.

Mr. LUCAS: I shall not delay the committee at any great length, but I wish definitely to place myself on record in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) this afternoon. I was not a member of the committee which considered this bill, but I took advantage of any opportunity that presented itself to visit the committee and see it in action. Yet in spite of all that has been said here this evening and what I heard in that committee the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) says that no substantial reason has yet been given for postponing the revision of the Bank Act. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons why the Conservative party went down to defeat in 1921 was because they did not have their finger close enough upon the pulse of public opinion in this country, and the result was that the people placed in office in their stead a new government thinking that it would respond more readily to public opinion. I would like to ask the government now what good reason they can give why this Bank Act revision should not be postponed for another year. Are we asking for anything unreasonable in view of the widespread unrest prevailing throughout Canada to-day?

I might say that our demand is backed up by resolutions from organizations from almost every part of Canada. I shall not weary the House by reading them, but I have here resolutions from the government of Manitoba, which is no small organization but represents the people of that whole province, from the government of Alberta, and from the Canadian Council of Agriculture, which represents thousands of organized farmers throughout the whole of Canada. I have also a letter here signed by Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress, which I propose to read:

> Dear Sir,—Communications received from a number of our affiliated organizations, including the Trades Councils at Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, London, Montreal, St. John and Halifax, all indicate that there is a widespread interest amongst the organized workers regarding the Banking Act.
>
> Labor opinion is strongly favorable to a thorough revision of the Banking Act and entirely opposed to hasty action on such an important matter. It is strongly felt that the mass of evidence submitted to the Banking Committee during this session should be thoroughly analyzed before final decision is reached as to what amendments of benefit to the public could be properly made to the Banking Act and that the present session of parliament is apparently too far advanced to admit of this being done.
>
> We would therefore respectfully urge that the revision of the Banking Act should be postponed until the next session of parliament and would greatly appreciate any assistance you can render to bring about such action.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the writer of that letter a director of the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. LUCAS: The letter is signed by Tom Moore, president, and P. M. Draper, secretary-treasurer, of the Trades and Labour Congress.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Moore was before the committee and he never suggested that the revision of the act be postponed. Furthermore he said he had nothing to propose by way of an amendment.

Mr. LUCAS: Here, of course, Mr. Moore is speaking for organized labour throughout Canada, and his letter speaks for itself. I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman as to Mr. Moore's views, but I have his letter here above his own signature. One of the reasons we in western Canada especially have for postponing the revision of this Bank Act is the lack of confidence that a great many of our farmers have in our banking system as it exists at the present time. I have here one of our farm papers containing a lengthy article headed "Financing the Farmer." It was put out by the superintendent of the Rural Credits branch of the Merchants Bank before that institution went out of existence. I shall quote only one short sentence:

> The farmer who takes his banker into his confidence at all times and under all conditions is making satisfactory progress, and he seldom finds it necessary to seek credit outside the bank to carry on his season's undertakings.

We have had advertisements in our farm papers out in that country along this line:

If you are sick, you go to your doctor for medical advice. If you are in legal difficulties you go to your lawyer. When in financial trouble, why not go to your banker? In this very article it says, "Place your confidence in your banker." I should just like to point out what happened through a man placing confidence in a banker. It is a case that happened in my own district involving an immigrant, one of the finest type that has ever landed in this country. He came from the Jersey islands and was worth considerable money, just the class of settler we are all anxious to see in Canada. He came over and settled in the town of Sedgewick. He went to his banker and placed his full confidence in him, and the result was that on the advice of that banker this settler placed $10,000 in a partnership which was in a very unstable condition. Just to prove that this partnership was in an unstable condition when this man invested his $10,000 in it, I wish to read a letter from the general manager of the Merchants Bank at Montreal which was produced at the trial, and just here I might say that our head bankers often claim that they are not quite responsible for all that the branch managers may do or say. This letter from the general manager of the bank at Montreal goes on to say, speaking of the condition this partnership was in at the time this immigrant invested his money in it:

> The inspector suggests that J. Burn has Mr. B. mesmerized, and we think you too. This account is on anything but a satisfactory basis and we want it cleaned up without delay. You say it is impossible to confirm our figures representing wheat, oats, flax, and barley, covered by the bank's pledges, but it is your business to know that the commodities are there.
>
> The door is wide open for perpetration of fraud, and we have seen it happen so often. On the lines of the authorized credit we shall not object, but you have given double the amount we have authorized. Bring it within $10,000 without delay and do not arrogate so much authority again. There is evidence in your liability list that Burn is getting into deep water. Send us a statement of the grain covered by the bank's pledges after you have seen it, obtain also a statement of stored grain and ask Burn to explain to you how he proposes to separate and identify the two classes of grain on hand.

I want to call particular attention to the last paragraph:

> If you don't get this account into line quickly I will relieve you of the management. Note that. Now get to work.

This manager got to work, and he was responsible for getting this settler freshly landed in Canada, and who had placed his confidence in that bank manager, to invest $10,000 in that partnership which inside of one year was in such a condition that it was wound up. I want to say that this new settler holds a very bitter feeling against the banks in western Canada in consequence. He sued the bank for fraudulent misrepresentation, and in summing up the judge said that it was not a matter of justice; he had to administer the law, and that the bank took shelter under an old law dating back as far as 1826. He said: "The advice was given verbally and not in writing, and therefore damages could not be recovered."

We heard Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, who is head I believe of the Canadian Bankers' Association, before the committee, and when asked if there was sufficient credit to meet the demands of the country he said:

> The demand for credit in Canada is less than the banks of Canada are able to take care of, substantially less, and the banks of Canada at the moment have large sums unemployed.

Now in view of the conditions the farmers of western Canada are up against at the present time it is hard to understand that statement. When we were asked to subscribe for victory bonds we were all told that those bonds were as good as gold at any time and that they would form a good basis of security if we wanted to borrow. What are the facts? We find that farmers in the West with victory bonds in their possession, who had met with losses in carrying on their farming operations, could not get loans on these bonds and were forced to sell them out and out. In view of that fact it is hard to understand Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor's statement that there is no lack of credit in Canada.

A short time ago I came across this extract from an article by Lord Milner in the London Observer:

> Labour is more and more inclined to question the competence of the bigwigs of industry and finance. There is a loss of confidence in the management.
>
> Such loss of confidence may not be wholly justified, but, in view of the extraordinary happenings of the last three or four years, it is not unnatural. Let us try to picture the impression which his experiences during those years are likely to have left on the mind of any fairly intelligent workman, a man, say, good at his own job, but with only so much information about the general affairs of the world as he could gather from the steady perusal of his daily paper. For months and months after the close of the war he had it dinned into his ears that the world was suffering from a shortage of goods, and he was overwhelmed with exhortations to him and the men of his class not to spare themselves, but to work with intensified energy to make up the deficiency. That, he was vehemently assured, was their duty to their country and the world, and at the same time the one sure road to the improvement of their own condition. Such was the unanimous appeal made to him by all the highest authorities in the world of industry and finance. And he obeyed it to the best of his ability, but only to find, a year or two later, that the warehouses of his employers were choked with goods which they could not sell, and that his services were no longer required.

And then, when, stung by disappointment, he began to probe for himself into the causes of this strange contradiction, he was told that there had unfortunately been a mistake, that the activity to which he had been so fervently exhorted to contribute was "feverish," that he ought to have known, we ought all to have known, that after the war there was bound to be a big slump, because "the pool of capital had been depleted" and we had no money for making things and nobody else had any money for buying them. . .

We all remember very well, when the war was on and afterwards, the advice which was sent out by the financial institutions of this country, especially when we farmers in Canada were complaining about the conditions we have to meet, "We have all got to make our sacrifices, we have all got to be patriotic." I should like to ask the chairman and the members of this committee whether the banks of Canada have taken their share of the losses, whether they have borne their share of the sacrifices undergone by the masses of the people of this country? We found that when the great mass of the people were suffering—not only on the farms but in our cities as well—banks were holding their annual meetings and declaring their usual dividends. At the annual meeting of every bank, while other people were undergoing sacrifices and enduring suffering, it was announced that the year had been a prosperous one and the customary dividends would be paid.

One of the things we hear a great deal of in Canada to-day is the necessity for an aggressive immigration policy. We all realize that we are staggering under a tremendous burden of debt and that in order to develop this vast country we should have more people here. But what inducement can we offer to bring immigrants to Canada? We find that in New Zealand, in Australia, and in the United States they have inaugurated some form of rural credit scheme in order to assist the farmers. We are spending millions of dollars on an immigration policy in order to bring settlers to Canada and what inducement are we offering these settlers? Let me compare what is being done for the farmer in the United States at the present time with what is being done in Canada. If a farmer takes out a loan for $1,000, under the present rural credit scheme, an amortization plan they have over there, in thirty-four years he will have paid back a total of $1,870. The farmer in Canada who takes out a loan of $1,000 must pay interest at the rate of 8 per cent and I may say there are a great many loans that bear a much heavier rate than 8 per cent. Taking out a loan on that basis in thirty-four years, instead of paying back $1,870 as in the case of his American cousin, he will pay back the much larger sum of $3,700. What inducement, therefore, is there for immigrants to come to Canada when if they settle in this country they have to compete in the same market with people who are much better situated.

I think the hon. member for Halifax admitted, I know many others have admitted, that there was a gap between our present financial system and the farmer. In view of that fact the government would give a great amount of satisfaction, especially to the members on this side, if, instead of trying to force this bill through at the present time, they would await the report of the special committee on agriculture and its recommendation in favour of some rural credit scheme, and give us some assurance that action along that line would be taken. In the absence of such assurance from the government it is our duty to protest that the bill to revise the Bank Act should not be put through at the present time.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Would it not be better to take some of the time now being consumed in trying to develop a rural credit scheme or some financial institution which might meet the situation my hon. friend says prevails to-day in the West? Is there any relation between commercial banking necessarily and a rural credit scheme?

Mr. LUCAS: That is what I was trying to tell the hon. gentleman. The special committee on agricultural conditions have spent practically the whole of this session in developing some such scheme, and yet this bill is being forced through in advance of that committee's recommendation.

Now, I do not wish to occupy time unnecessarily. As I said at the beginning of my remarks I did not intend to make any lengthy argument, but I do feel that it is the duty of the government, in view of the existing conditions, to try and evolve some rural credit scheme that will meet the needs of the agriculturists of Canada. One of the things that I know for a fact is this: As a result of the economic conditions that we are now struggling against the farmers are getting into a condition almost of despair, and unless we can take back to those farmers from this long session of parliament some hope—some little ray of hope—that relief is going to be given them to enable them to get out from under the tremendous burden they are carrying, there is going to be a greater exodus from Canada than has been witnessed in the past. I want to give credit to other hon. members in this House. I believe we are all sincerely desirous of building up this country, but I think that after the months we have spent in session

here, this government should try to establish some rural credit scheme that would afford relief to our agriculturists. We find that in practically every other country of the world some scheme of this character has been evolved. To-day the people of Canada are looking to this government for leadership in the matter, and I hope that before this session closes the government will come forward with some scheme calculated to remedy the existing situation.

Mr. FORKE: I rather hesitate to take part in this debate feeling as I do the lack of information which other members in this group possess in relation to the question of bank revision. Before dealing with this subject, I should like to pay my tribute to those members of the Banking committee who have devoted their time so assiduously and who have studied so carefully the different phases of the banking question. I for one, reading only cursorily the reports in the newspapers, have been rather surprised at their astuteness and the careful consideration that has been given to many questions that have come before the Banking committee. I admit that the question has now become rather tedious; it is taking a long time; it has been carefully considered; but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that a question is never settled until it is settled right, and I question very much if we have reached the place where we can say that this question has been rightly settled.

Perhaps some little trouble was occasioned at the beginning by certain theories being propounded before the Banking committee that rather alarmed some members in the committee and in this House. I might say that they were needlessly alarmed when one takes into consideration who at present occupies the position of Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the composition of this parliament. I think hon. members may rest assured that nothing very radical or serious is likely to happen in this parliament as regards the Bank Act. I have every respect for the Minister of Finance—I will take second place to no one in that regard—but, perhaps, having been in that position for a long time, he has seen things working fairly smoothly; he is certainly well content with things as they are and he is rather careful that, at least, if he should err, he would err upon the side of safety. He has been very safe in this case. From what I can learn, no very great difference has been made in the Bank Act; it is substantially the same Bank Act that we have had during the last ten years.

[Mr. Lucas.]

I believe throughout the country at the present time there is considerable dissatisfaction with our financial conditions, and I for one would like to see this question carefully considered. I can speak from personal experience. I have in my room upstairs a large volume of evidence that has been taken before the Banking committee. I have not had time to read a single issue of that evidence and I am perfectly certain that, perhaps, the majority of the members of this House are exactly in the same position. They are asked to vote for this Bank Act, and they do not know what all this is about, or what all the evidence is that has been taken before the committee. I do not think in the history of parliament has such a volume of evidence been taken, or has the question been shaken up so thoroughly as during the time evidence has been taken on the stand before that committee. I claim that as one reason why I think the members of this House and the people of this country should have time to consider this question in all its bearings. I have had requests from bankers to send them some copies of the evidence, and I am sure the bankers of Canada are not acquainted with the evidence, nor have they given it sufficient consideration to enable them to make to their members the suggestions they might make if they were familiar with all that evidence. Perhaps the people who are anxious to go too far have played into the hands of those who do not want to go at all. I do not know if hon. members will understand just what I mean. They have made people afraid, and those who might have been willing to go a little further have been afraid to move just for fear some of the ideas that have been propounded should be put into practice. As I said before, this revision will not be final in any case. There should be no antagonism between the different classes in our country. It should be very evident to everyone that banks can live only by the business they do with the people of the country; and if a system is adopted that is detrimental to the business of the country, it does not matter whether that business is agricultural or industrial, in the long run the banks also will suffer, so that the banks and the people after all are interested in seeing that we have a proper financial system.

I have a short extract from an article written by Colonel MacLaren in the last issue of the Financial Post. I will read this, and I want hon. members to pay particular attention. The article reads:

The proceedings before the Bankers' committee have not improved matters in spite of the efforts of the

chairman, A. K. Maclean, one of the most tactful men in the House, aided by the very broad knowledge of the Minister of Finance. The financiers and the farmers across Canada are drifting into real antagonism.

I for one deplore the fact that there should be any antagonism between the different classes in this Dominion of ours. It should have been the business of the financiers of this country to come forward and give all assistance in their power to provide the very best possible financial institutions. From what I hear—I cannot speak from actual knowledge—the stand taken by the bankers has been that we have an admirable banking system and that it cannot be much improved on. Such an attitude of superiority of great knowledge should not be taken when people know things have not been functioning just as well as they really should. The writer goes on to say:

> The blame does not rest with the farmers. The farmers are not radicals.

I want hon. members to pay attention to that, because I know hon. members in this part of the House are sometimes looked upon as bolshevists and radicals who are willing to upset everything and to create disturbance in every branch and line of industry. Nothing is further from them than that. The writer continues:

> They are capitalists themselves, very closely allied to and in deep sympathy with good business and sound finances, and with little real sympathy for political interference in business. They want some sound way of temporary borrowing.

I might go on to say that they want longer credits even than our banks are willing to give at the present time. I should like again to emphasize the statement that farmers as a class are not radicals, nor are they bolshevists. There are no people in this country as able and willing to stand up for the institutions and the welfare of the country as are the farmers of Canada. If you will allow me to make an interjection at this point, I remember the strike in the city of Winnipeg, when the people lost their heads, and the cry heard then was "The farmers will save them; the farmers will save them". Why was that? Because they were the most stable element in the whole population of this Dominion.

There are going to be changes in the coming years in any case. I do not care how this committee votes on the present division; I will make the prophecy,—and I am perfectly sure of it,—that within ten years there are going to be changes in the Bank Act. To my mind, one of the things of greatest importance at the present time in connection with our banking institutions is the matter of credit getting into the hands of a few men. Have hon. members ever considered what credit means, what power it gives? If ever the credit of Canada gets into the hands of a few men, they can make and unmake industry, institutions, individuals just as they like, and I for one am alarmed to see the banking institutions of our country gradually converging into the hands of a few people. I listened with great attention and pleasure to the very eloquent speech of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey). Like myself he hesitates to discuss currency and banking. They are intricate and rather difficult matters to understand, but I think I know enough to realize that currency and banking are really international affairs and go wider than the bounds of our own Dominion.

I do not intend to make any lengthy speech, for the simple reason that I have given this question no particular study; but I think the members in this part of the House are making a very reasonable request. They are asking nothing out of the way; they are not going to upset any industry. Business can be readily assured that this House is not going to do anything tremendously radical, and business can go on during the years to come, quite confident that nothing is going to happen that will hurt it very much.

Not very much attention has been paid by members on the government side of the House to the fact that we have had requisitions and resolutions passed by governing bodies, two provincial legislatures and a large farming association in the West, asking that the revision be held over for a year, or, at least, that charters be only granted for one year. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has said that he has not heard us give any reasons. I think several reasons have been given. One is the fact that we feel the need at the present time of some intermediary system of banking between short-term credits and what may be called the farm loan system of long-term credits. We need some system of rural credit, and as a member once said in the House, we have only one system of banking at present. We have no other. We do not know of any proposition the government is likely to make. I was disappointed when the Minister of Finance made his speech that he did not give some promise that the government was going to look into some system of rural credits for financing the farmers for some three or four years which could be done; and if we allow the Bank Act to go through now, I feel certain that we are not going to see a Dominion system of rural credit for some considerable length of time. I do not wish to

discuss the matter further, because I am not very well posted. I have not had the privilege of attending the meetings and hearing the evidence placed before the committee. I can see nothing unreasonable or out of the way in making the request that the bank charters be extended for one year only. I am sure that members on the other side of the House do not understand public opinion in the West. The statement of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) that the government had received one shot already is perfectly true, and the second shot might be fatal as far as the government is concerned.

Mr. EVANS. There are several reasons why clause 5 should be amended. I think it has been apparent to us now for many years that our Canadian banking system does not adequately meet the needs or the interests throughout this Dominion. I think this is particularly true as regards the basic industry of agriculture. As one of those concerned with that industry, I shall endeavour to give some reasons why the revision of the act should be deferred for another year. A mass of evidence has been secured by the committee on Banking, which, if properly sifted and digested by men capable of dealing with this question would give us a lead by which we could evolve a system which would adequately meet the needs of the basic industry, and serve the needs of the industry of this country in a fair and impartial manner, particularly the basic industry of agriculture which is now mostly suffering. Now, Mr. Chairman, some of those gentlemen who seem so anxious that this revision should take place, have in the recent past given utterance to statements and opinions which would go to show that they themselves realized, to some extent at least, that the present system does not adequately meet the needs of the interests of this Dominion. For instance, Sir Vincent Meredith realized the helplessness of the present system to adequately finance our export trade so as, he said, to keep our factories open and give employment to our workingmen. He said:

> If foreign trade can be revived it will solve many of our difficulties.

In fact speaking at the annual meeting of his bank in 1920 he became emphatic and declared that sooner or later this question must be dealt with by the banks, and the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that Sir Vincent Meredith, in this speech to which I now refer, December 6, 1920, realized the helplessness of the banks, to aid the industries and take advantage of any opportunity which fate might offer. So we see that even our bankers are beginning to realize that our much-lauded Canadian banking system has fallen down in that it fails to meet the immediate needs of the country. It is not merely agriculture that is suffering; in fact it is plain to everyone that our cities to-day are suffering, and that our workingmen have had to migrate to seek work. I think, Sir, it would be a crime to extend the charters for the present inefficient system—yes, admitted to be inefficient—for ten years, without profiting by the experience which has been furnished us by the evidence of those who appeared before the Banking committtee this session. Theoretically, our system is as efficient as it was twenty years ago when we had money to assist in the harvesting of the United States crop, according to William Long Baker, who has written a very able treatise on banking in Canada. But, I think the most interesting point of this candid confession of weakness is that, in so far as the public is concerned, no move has been made to cure the trouble. Two whole years have gone by since Sir Vincent Meredith recognized this, and our bankers who have realized their own weakness have done nothing to improve the trade of the country, and the responsibility for that certainly rests on the shoulders of such a body of men, seeing that it is they who control the circulation of the very lifeblood of industry—finance. Our factories have not been busy, and were it not for our close proximity to the United States we would, this last winter, have had an unemployment problem on our hands such as we never saw before, and indeed, it is questionable if our Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) would have been able to cope with the awful disturbances that would surely have ensued.

All these conditions exist in Canada, while an unprecedented era of peace and industry prevail in the United States under a more elastic system of credit. But agriculture is not the only industry that has fallen down. If the capitalistic system of our country is all right, why are not our industries working? Now, while a patriotic minority in this House seeks to put off the revision of our banking system for another year, we find the present banking combine able to control parliament to such an extent that the representatives of the people jealously guard the present inadequate and contracting system at the expense of industry. The banks are semi-public institutions. They are joint stock companies founded for private gain, but they accomplish this end with the earnings of the public. A question which should be answered to-day is: What are our seventeen bankers doing in the public interest? It is time, in the interests of this country, that this awful monopoly con-

trolling industry and credit should be broken, and this House will commit a crime against the workers of the land if they renew the present system with only such minor amendments as are contemplated in the amended draft before us.

The banking system is a monopoly and has been for years until to-day it is able to entirely control industry in any way it chooses. Under this system the public have no voice in the direction in which their earnings are loaned. Taking September 30th last, the total paid-up capital of the seventeen chartered banks I find to be $125,004,717; the total liabilities $2,342,980,663; the deposits amounted to the tremendous sum of $1,648,647,555. So we see to what extent the banks are indebted to the public for the deposits on which they make so large a part of their profits. We also see to what extent the people have trusted the banks until they have become such a complete monopoly that they are bound by no law whatsoever. They take the people's deposits at 3 per cent and loan them out for anything up to 9 or 10 per cent. All renewed loans this year in the West, so far as I can find out, are made at 9 per cent, unless interest is paid in advance. In a letter from an old friend in my constituency who lives adjacent to the town of Asquith he has this to say:

> I told you they had increased the rate from 8 to 9 per cent. This time I wanted to know what the rate was, and was told I could have the note renewed at 8 per cent. When the note was being made out I was asked if I intended paying the interest then. I asked why. Why should I pay interest for a period of service before the service began? He replied that I could pay at the end if I like, but it would be some more, and altered the note accordingly to 9 per cent.

And he asks:

> Is it not time the paying interest beforehand, or alternately paying interest on interest, for which no service has been given was changed? Why not have a straight rate to be charged after the service has been given? The present system seems only useful to confound the average customer until we don't know exactly what we are paying.

I submit, Sir, that as things are at present the farmers cannot pay 8 or 9 per cent. I think a commission of inquiry between now and next session could do splendid work in establishing these facts, and then we could deal with the revision in an intelligent manner.

Our banking monopoly is given privileges not equalled in any other country in the world. The banks may, without making any deposits in the central gold reserve, issue notes up to the full amount of their unimpaired capital, and it is incorrect indeed to suppose, as we did in the past, that the whole of the bank notes in circulation are backed by deposits of gold. It is not so. This is a very valuable privilege, and it enables our banks to open branches throughout the whole country. They say they do this to serve the needs of the people. I am not so sure of that. Sir Edmund Walker, giving evidence before the Banking committee in 1913, admitted that it was the profits from the note issue that permitted the banks to open such a large number of branches. At present I think the seventeen chartered banks have about four thousand branches throughout the country. It is time that this privilege was curtailed and some check placed upon this free issue.

I know the banks are required to make monthly returns. The Minister of Finance, too, may call for special returns at any time. But what value we may attach to these returns in the face of what transpired in the Merchants Bank failure, when the president and other officials were exonerated from all blame, is more than I know. It is hardly to be expected that a concern of this kind would let the public know its exact condition, particlarly if it happened to be on the down grade.

I think one of the chief reasons why this revision should be delayed, or granted only for one year, is the fact that our banking monopoly has the power in its hands to enhance the price of any commodity and, on the other hand, to cripple any industry by withholding credit. This is certainly a power that should not be given into the hands of any class of men. The branch banks exist for collecting the people's earnings, to be used in any other part of the country instead of for the development of the community in which those earnings were made. Now, Mr. Chairman, the trouble with different parts of our country to-day is that the branch bank system collects the earnings of the people to be used in enterprises far remote from where those earnings have been gathered, and I submit that the West in particular is suffering from this evil to-day. We have no industries in western Canada, nor are we likely to have as long as our earnings are tapped for the benefit of industries in other parts of the country. Indeed, there is only one banking concern that has its headquarters west of the Great Lakes. I say it is a real objection to our banking system as at present constituted and carried on that no profits, or practically none, are distributed in the locality where they are made. The whole monopoly is used for the benefit of the monopoly and is more and more impoverishing the rural parts of the Dominion. Indeed, Sir, it is to be regretted that to this accursed system of centralization of

capital and industry the Dominion to-day stands indebted for a contracted population of eight or nine million people instead of more than double that number, as we should have.

I have said that the banks are a law unto themselves. In the West they have always charged what interest they chose to exact, and they have always compelled the payment of notes at any time they pleased to name. Indeed, it is not so long ago, in 1907 in fact, when the banks took part in a great conspiracy to compel the western grain grower to ship his grain through the Grain Combine's elevator instead of using the loading platform. I think the banks went outside their proper sphere of business in taking that action. I think they should be prevented from purchasing agricultural products, particularly for speculative purposes. I do not think it is a healthy state of affairs for any people when they are at the mercy of a combine or of combines who dictate the methods they shall use to market their products. No one can estimate the possibilities of Canada's future. No one knows far ahead what problems we may have to solve. Our financial system is the pivot on which everything else revolves, and it is surely in the public interest that this revision should be put off until the people in the country can make their wants known along lines of experience as brought out before the Banking committee of the present session.

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, I want to protest against this shoving of the Bank Act through and the granting of the charters for another ten years—which is speaking in favour of the amendment. I believe that the charters should be granted for one year only. I have not prepared a speech, but I do not feel that I should let this opportunity pass without adding my voice to the volume of voices that has arisen in protest against the undue haste of the bankers and their friends in this matter. Our request is surely a very reasonable one, and it has that which is necessary in parliament to give it an air of respectability; it has a precedent. Now, I was a member of the Banking committee—not an able one, I am willing to admit that, but at least an interested one and one who attended the meetings quite regularly. I found that it was generally the bankers who came there to give evidence; that the small manufacturer—in fact, the large one—the businessman, the representatives of basic industries, did not come to give their evidence and to tell how the Bank Act as at present constituted affected their business. To me this is a very good reason why the final revision of the Bank Act should be postponed and the charters granted for one year only. The attitude of members of the Banking committee and the harmony with which the two old traditional parties worked together there brought me to the position where I felt it would be well to grant the charters for one year only instead of for ten.

Now, the question of national currency is a very large one. A great many people to-day think we should have a national currency instead of the bank currency; others think that either the bankers or the government should go into the issuing of currency, but not both. Then, there are a great many who think that this privilege of issuing currency is a valuable one for which the banks do not pay sufficiently either in the form of taxes to the government or in the form of services to the public. That would seem to me a very good reason for asking that the revision be postponed for one year. In talking to manufacturers—not only to a few, but to many—I found that all honest manufacturers objected most strenuously to section 88 and were very anxious that it should be changed. They should be given a hearing, surely; they are usually given a hearing by the government of Canada, I think, and I do not see why they should be discriminated against in this particular instance. On the other hand, from the banks' point of view, they claim that the Bank Act is perfect. Well, if it is, it will stand being looked at for another year—because perfection will bear scrutiny. Indeed, if the Bank Act is perfect, the bankers, their eminent counsel, the government and their friends in the opposition, would gain by allowing the public to have a good look at it, because it would strengthen their position; it would show that we who are attacking it are wrong, and you would then have the club over our head. So from your own point of view, since you people who know so much about it are sure it is perfect, it would be well for you to let us have a look at it; it would, according to your argument, simply strengthen your own position.

It seems to me an odd thing for a Liberal government that stands for a fuller life and larger freedom—or is it a larger life and fuller freedom—to insist on rushing the Bank Act through this year. I am going to give you a little warning. I am not anxious to save the government, and never have been, as my course in this House has proved. But I am going to tell you this: You may unite with the official opposition; you may work with what I am quite convinced is great pressure from behind, but if in opposition to the just

demands of legitimate industry, not only farming but other basic industries, and not only basic industries, but the key industries that are usually called the secondary industries—if in opposition to these you insist on forcing it through, you are only bringing destruction on yourself. It is written, I believe, that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad;" so it is your affair—and it will be your funeral, not ours. You see, the very fact that you people who stand for rushing it through are so anxious to do that makes the general public suspicious that there is some particular reason for the hurry.

Of course, bankers have ever been moral cowards; they have always been afraid. When two leading banks in England many years ago decided to give out bank books and allow people to issue cheques against their deposits, the other banks said it would be the ruination of the financial system, but as everybody knows the financial system is standing strong and steady yet. You remember what Professor Fisher of Yale University said—and we cannot discount all his statements—that bankers were natural standpatters; that they were afraid of change. Some of the people who know these bankers well ought to tell them to buck up and not be so utterly frightened; they would gain more by not being so fearful about these things. I was in the country for four days and I talked Bank Act everywhere I went. I asked everybody I talked to privately what they thought about it—business people, manufacturers, farmers, professional men—and I met none who said they thought the Bank Act should go through this year. They were of the opinion that it had been too long a session—whether a fruitful one, at least a wearisome one; that something had to be discarded unless we were to stay here a great length of time yet; that it was reasonable to leave the Bank Act over, particularly in view of the fact that the evidence had not been considered, that it was a rushed affair.

I said, too, when this matter came up in committee, and I would like to say it again: If the rush was so great, why did the government not start sooner? It is a wonder it was left until after Easter if the rush was so great. I was willing to have come here much earlier; I was willing to have sat in committee long before Easter, and I think a great many other members were too. This hurry, I say, does seem odd, and I know it seems odd to a great many others. A large number of the people think the banking system as at present constituted does not serve productive industry; that it much more generously serves speculation. If once that idea gets fastened in the public mind it will be a very disastrous thing for the banks and for the friends of the bankers. So, I say, why not be reasonable while you have yet the chance? At least if you are unreasonable, and if some years from now you wish you had not been, remember that I warned you.

Mr. IRVINE: I rise to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), and I hope that I shall be able to give at least one reason that will be considered to be such by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). Of course, the debate has advanced considerably since that hon. gentleman made the remark that no reason had been offered why the bank charters should be extended for one year only instead of ten. It is difficult for me to decide what would constitute a reason for the hon. member for Halifax, for we all reason somewhat differently. I am sorry, however, that while he did not consider as arguments what were put forward as such by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, he did not do them the courtesy of even considering their utterances as arguments at least from their own point of view and answering them accordingly. However, he chose to sweep them aside with a mystic wave of the hand and say, they are not arguments at all. That is the easiest way I know out of a difficulty on the floor of this House or anywhere else in debate, simply to say that what the opponent has said is not an argument and leave it at that.

Another thing that the hon. member for Halifax said was that he did not know how long it was going to take hon. members over on this side of the House to make up their minds. Were they going to take all day, a week, a month or a decade to make up their minds, was his query? Well, I cannot speak for the Progressives in that regard. I do not know how long they are going to take to make up their minds on this question, but I would say to the committee that it would be better for us to take ten years to make up our mind and make it up right than to pass an inadequate act that will last ten years, an act that has no mind in it at all. That would be a better proposition. I would suggest, however, that it did not take the hon. member for Halifax very long to make up his mind on this matter. He did it with great haste seemingly. In fact, I think he was always ready to pass the act even before we began to consider it, judging from his attitude in committee.

I was surprised, however, when the hon. member for Halifax confessed to knowing about the Merchants Bank collapse. It has been advanced by hon. members on this side

of the House that an investigation should be held into the Merchants Bank failure. The reason they are asking for that is that one of the functions of the Bank Act, or at least of the act as it should have been revised, would be to prohibit any such recurrence as the collapse of the Merchants Bank, but we cannot make an act that will safeguard against a recurrence of the Merchants Bank incident unless we know why it was that the Merchants Bank failed. When we were in committee, Mr. Chairman, nobody knew why the Merchants Bank failed. The hon. member for Halifax did not know why the Merchants Bank failed. The Finance Minister declared that he did not know. Sir Edmund Walker declared that he did not know. Nobody knew in committee why the Merchants Bank failed, but now the hon. member for Halifax knows. In fact, he comes in with a huge blanket, a blanket that is broad enough and long enough to cover up every crime in history, and he places that right over the Merchants Bank condition and says that it was due to human frailty. He goes further than that. After he has told us why it failed, he proves to us that it did not fail at all. That is good reasoning. He says it only weakened a little in the joints, so to speak, and when it got wobbly it fell gently into the arms of a larger institution. Now it might be necessary for us to find out just how the arms of the other institution came to be there to receive the Merchants Bank when it got wobbly in the joints. That might be a good reason why the revision of the Bank Act should be postponed for another year. If the Merchants Bank did not fail, did not something worse happen to it than that, something far more dangerous to the people of Canada than even a bank failure?

Mr. JACOBS: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to tell him that the Merchants Bank did not fail?

Mr. IRVINE: I thank the hon. gentleman for restating what I had just stated, that the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax, which I think in this regard ought to be a good one, is that the Merchants Bank did not fail, it only weakened. I am saying that if it did not fail it constitutes a more dangerous situation for the people of Canada and for the industries of this country than if it did fail, because it suggests a condition which permits a fuller development of banking mergers in this country. The banking merger is growing apace. We are reduced now, I think, to seventeen banks—seventeen banks with one single voice. They meet together in association, they fix the rate of interest on deposits, they fix the rate of interest on loans—a huge co-operative monopoly. If, I repeat, the Merchants Bank did not fail, if it was swallowed by a larger institution of the same kind, that is a menace far more to be feared than the mere failure of the bank would have constituted.

Now, I cannot speak about the Merchants Bank failure because I do not know why it happened, or if it was not a failure, I do not know what it was. All that I know is this, that the Merchants Bank, which was one of the largest banking institutions in this country, suddenly stopped doing business as the Merchants Bank, and as a result of the stoppage some $5,500,000 of the shareholders' money was lost and the whole institution passed into the hands of the Bank of Montreal at a very, very low price indeed. It is true I believe that when the Bank of Montreal took over the Merchants Bank, the Merchants Bank had some one and a half million dollars still in reserve, and I also believe that it was considered to be in a solvent condition. If so, how did it come that the Bank of Montreal got such an excellent deal in taking it over? That is another thing that ought to be explained. Perhaps it would be wise to have an investigation into that alone. That is a matter of interest to the Canadian people; it is of interest to the shareholders of that bank; it is of interest to the shareholders of all banks because the same thing may be repeated in connection with another bank next year. That in itself in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, constitutes an argument why this act should not now be passed extending these charters for ten years. If it is not an argument I would like the hon. member for Halifax to tell me what is the weakness about it. What is the matter with the argument? I would like him to tell me and answer it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have no hesitation in telling my hon. friend that it is no argument at all. Perhaps he might inform the House by telling us what relation there is between the failure of the Merchants Bank, or the losses it sustained which later induced it to sell out to another bank, and the present act which we are considering. Can my hon. friend inform the House of that?

Mr. IRVINE: I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has pointed out to me that I have failed to make myself clear to him. I shall now take the opportunity of restating very briefly the relation between the

present act and the failure or non-failure of the Merchants Bank.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has been discussing the case of the Merchants Bank, he must confine himself to clause 5 of the bill.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman, I quite understand that. What I am discussing is the amendment to clause 5 and that amendment asks for the renewal of the bank charters for one year instead of renewing them for ten years, and I am trying to make an argument why the renewal should only be for one year instead of ten. At the same time I am answering a question bearing upon the particular point. I am going to advance the argument that the failure of the Merchants Bank has a direct connection with this bill and with this particular clause, and I shall do it in this way: As a result of the trial which took place over the Merchants Bank nobody was punished. I presume they were not punished because it was discovered that they had not violated any clause of the Bank Act. If what happened in the Merchants Bank case transpired without violating any clause of the Bank Act then it is clear that there was nothing in that act which prevented such an occurrence from taking place. My argument then is, that seeing we are now revising the Bank Act we should have a clause or clauses which would make it impossible for that kind of thing to take place and for people who commit such malpractice to stay out of gaol.

The next step in the argument is this: It is the duty of this parliament to amend the Bank Act in such a way as to make the Merchants Bank case impossible of recurrence. We cannot do that unless we know what happened in the Merchants Bank case. We cannot know what happened there unless we investigate it, and we cannot investigate it unless the bill be referred back to committee or unless we have an opportunity which an extension for another year would give us. If we pass this bill and let the matter go for ten years, and if in the meantime two or three other banks fail in a similar manner—in such an event what argument then will the hon. member for Halifax bring forward when we confront him with the opportunity which is afforded now of amending this in a way that would render it impossible for such a thing to occur without those affected being able at least to put their hands on the guilty parties? That is the argument which connects the Merchants Bank case directly with this bill and with the particular clause under discussion.

Now, as I was saying when the hon. member interrupted me, the Merchants Bank was seemingly in a solvent condition when it was taken over. One of two things seems to be certain so far as I have been able to gather from the evidence that was brought out during the trial, as well as from questions which were put in committee. Either there was very bad management which might have been safeguarded by legislation, and was not, which accounted for the position of the Merchants Bank, or else there was a frame-up for a merger from which frame-up the Bank of Montreal profited. Now, there are the only two possible solutions of the difficulty that I can conceive, and I do not think it is fair that the people of Canada should be left in doubt as to which of these two things was the correct reason. Again I say the only way to settle that is by an investigation, and the only way to get an investigation is to pass this amendment and to grant the charters for one year, then take the bill up again next year and revise it and pass it for ten years if desired. That is the argument. The cause is not known. We have, as I pointed out, two probable causes and I have given them to you. We have, in addition to the two probable causes with regard to the Merchants Bank case, one anticipation and one certainty. The anticipation is that under the present Bank Act some other bank might come into the same difficulty as we found in the case of the Merchants Bank. The certainty, the only certainty we have in regard to the whole affair is that the confidence of the people of Canada has been shaken in the banking system. It is all very well for the hon. member for Halifax to stand up and say, with a smile of complacency and virtue," We have the greatest banking system in the world," but when we have a banking system which allows such a thing as happened in the Merchants Bank case, we have an argument that is far more potent in the public mind that the mere statement of even such a gentleman as my hon. friend.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I ask my hon. friend not to state that I said it was the best banking system in the world because the hon. gentleman must know I did not say that.

Mr. IRVINE: If I misquoted the hon. gentleman I must apologize but I understood him to say that. If he did not say it was the best system in the world I would like him to tell me just how good it is.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would rather my hon. friend devote his time to showing why we should postpone this bill; he has not started on it yet.

Mr. IRVINE: As I pointed out at the outset, as to what constitutes an argument depends as much upon the mentality of those who listen as upon the mentality of the man who is making the argument. With that remark I shall leave my argument to the judgment of the House and to the judgment of those who may some time enter the sarcophagus in which we are now to bury this argument and look at what is said on this issue.

Mr. JACOBS: Before the hon. gentleman quits that part of his argument will he tell me whether he is prepared to state that if this delay is granted he will be able to frame an act which will prevent any bank getting into trouble in the future?

Mr. IRVINE: That question, Mr. Chairman is unworthy of the brilliance that I know the hon. member who asked the question possesses. I am not called upon to make any prophecy as to what might be the possible outcome of the investigation. True we might investigate and discover nothing but even if we did that it would be a certain amount of satisfaction. Then we might investigate and find out something wrong and not be able to rectify it, in which case our plight would amount to a defeat of the intelligence of this parliament. But to expect me to make now a definite promise that I will frame an act which will meet any difficulty we may encounter in the investigation requested is asking something that I think is altogether unreasonable.

Now, let me proceed with another argument and I do hope that the hon. member for Halifax will see there is reason in this. Just before doing so I want to go back for a minute to the statement which has been made, I think in the Banking and Commerce committee if it has not been made in Committee of the Whole, that the Bank Act as it is now is not a fixed thing, that it may be changed once a year if we so desire it. That is a very plausible argument and I want to deal

11 p.m. with it for a moment before I advance another reason why this bill should be postponed as we require. It seems to be democratic, it seems to be theoretically right, when we say that this act is not fixed at all, that it may be amended any day, that parliament is supreme in this matter. That sounds good but if we just puncture that bubble there is nothing left of it. Let us see how we would begin to puncture it. In the first place there is a moral obligation involved in this franchise, a moral obligation which I do not hesitate to say would be very speedily advanced on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite if we were to bring in next year a clause to amend some fundamental principle in the Bank Act. But leaving that aside, how is it going to be amended, who is going to do it? I do not see the government doing it; I have no vision of that at all. If there was going to be any amendment whatsoever in this Bank Act next year, or the year following, or any year within the decade we are allotting it, such amendment would have to be brought in by some private member. What opportunity has a private member to get a bill through this House? He has an excellent opportunity theoretically. Why, if I were over in the United States and boasting of the fine parliamentary system we have in this country I could say in my speech that I could pass any act. But as a private member in this House, I cannot even get one before the House. I brought in a private bill this year. the first one I think on the order paper. It is still there, and it will be there next year and I have no assurance that next year will be more favourable. Again let us not forget that there is always the opportunity of ruling it out of order because it involves a public expenditure. We cannot pass a private bill without printing it on paper, and if we print it on paper, that involves a public expenditure. If public expenditure is involved, then no private member can bring in a bill. Who is going to amend the Bank Act?

Mr. JACOBS: The Bank Act was amended three times between 1913 and this year.

Mr. IRVINE: If the Bank Act was amended three times, I would not be surprised if the amendments came as a suggestion from the bankers, were carried out by the government of the day and did not constitute a fundamental amendment. I think you will find Sir Edmund Walker congratulating himself and the Bankers' Association on the fact that any amendment that has ever been made to the Bank Act has been the direct suggestion of the Bankers' Association. That, to my mind, does not constitute an amendment of the character I am speaking in favour of now. I have no doubt amendments will be made, if they are in the interests of the bankers; but if they are in the interests of a new financial system, they will not be introduced, they will not be made.

Let me come to another reason, and, I think, even a more important reason why the charters should be granted for one year only than that of the investigation of the Merchants Bank case. I propose to show that, at this time the charters should not be extended for ten years by this parliament to the banks of Canada, because there must be.

I believe, a readjustment of the financial system to meet modern industrial conditions if a serious disaster is to be prevented in the near future. In support of that contention, let me say to the committee that at the present time our ideas, the ideas of the civilized world, are not moving as fast as events are moving. Events are moving much faster than we are thinking. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) will assure me that he is thinking in finance ten years ahead of the industrial situation, I would pass this bill with at least, a greater measure of confidence. But I doubt that very much; I doubt whether any of us are capable of thinking ten years ahead. In the face of the swiftness of the changing industrial panorama of the present time, we cannot think that far ahead. If we fix the Bank Act now, and five years from now changes come which might practically tie up the whole industrial system, what are you going to do? Would it not be better for us to consider this carefully as we go, to take into consideration as far as we possibly can all the factors before we fix an act for ten years? Will the present financial system last ten years? Will the government assure the committee that it will? If the government knows that the system is going to last ten years will they inform the House as to the ground for their faith; what are the reasons that this act must be passed this year? What are the reasons the government can give to assure us that the financial system will last for ten years more. It will take more than the Bank Act to stop the financial system from falling. The Bank Act is not an act which will support the financial system; it is an act which will support the bankers. It will hold up the bankers as long as the system stands, but it will not hold up the system. The system is greater than even the Bank Act and greater than even the government is. The life of the system depends, not upon the Bank Act, but upon economic conditions.

In support of my contention that in ten years some very serious problems will arise involving fundamental changes, I wish to say first that there are at least, two ominous signs that there will be great need of change before ten years are up. Let me refer in the first place in this connection to the great industrial paradox which ought to challenge the thought of all thinking people. The paradox is this: On the one hand we have a superabundance of raw material, of plant equipment and of labour, sufficient by all calculation to bring into being all the goods civilization requires for its necessities. On the other hand, we have communities in dire need of those very commodities we have the potentiality to produce. That is the industrial paradox, and the financial system, as I shall show, has a very close and direct connection with that industrial paradox. The situation is growing worse; it is growing serious, and before ten years go by a condition may develop which will compel, on the part of those in command of affairs, speedy action which may afterwards be regretted if it is not taken after serious and careful consideration. But there are other examples of this kind. Let me give the committee a sample. Nearly all the victorious countries in the last great war, for instance, claimed that Germany should be compelled to pay; but they discovered that the more Germany paid, the worse it was for the recipients. There is another paradox. There was a time when our financial system was at such a stage of development that it was possible for one nation to pay another without making the nation that received worse off than it was before. But the industrial situation has developed to such an extent that the more Germany pays Great Britain, for instance, the worse it becomes for Great Britain. That is a fact that we have to face. What does that mean? It means that the events in the industrial world have changed much faster than the financial ideas of financiers, changed so fast that the financier is defeated in his own purpose. That is an argument, I submit, in favour of our taking time and going slowly with the revision of the Bank Act, because in ten years more serious developments may have taken place, and the financial system may utterly collapse beneath the industrial demands.

The second sign of this decay is in what I am going to call the impotence of governments and of industrial masters to deal with the developing situation. If there were in the action of the present government any assurance that it was capable of handling a situation such as I have hinted might develop, if there were any assurances given that the actions of the government would be such as to guarantee the continuation of the industrial system producing goods for human needs, no matter what might take place, I would support this bill with much less reluctance. But let me summarize the advice of governments generally and the advice of leaders in the industrial world with respect to the problem which I have just suggested to the committee. First of all, I think nearly every government, certainly our present government in Canada, consoles itself with the idea that the present industrial situation is one that grew out of the war; that similar occurrences have followed war throughout history.

in short that depression is the inevitable result of war. It advises the people of this country to grin and bear it. Just keep on grinning and bearing it. It will come out all right in the end somehow; we do not know just how but it is coming. I submit it is going; it is not coming at all. That is merely a more or less blind consolation. I think nearly all governments have followed that example in taking consolation to themselves from the platitudes of the centuries past, but the platitudes of the centuries past have proved themselves entirely incapable of meeting immediate practical problems. Then the next consolation which we get from our government is that it is not so bad in this country as it is in other countries. That is the next step the present government takes, and that is what other governments say to the people who are troubled about having no work to do, or about their inability to meet the financial situation, or the tremendous percentages of bankruptcies that have occurred. They say, "We are told these things are not so bad here as they are in other countries". When you come to Great Britain they say the same thing. In the United States they say the same thing, and in Germany the same thing is repeated. I would like to know who is right in that case, but it is poor consolation and poor argument after all. It is like a man standing on the street watching a block of houses burning. His house is one of the block, and all the rest of the houses are blazing, but he turns to the man next to him and says, "Never mind, my house is not blazing nearly as badly as yours, and the situation is not so bad for me as it is for you". That would be poor consolation for a man, and so it is poor consolation for the people of this country, or the people of any other country to be told that the people of other countries are in just as bad a condition. Then the government take another step and they say "Produce more; the only solution for the present situation is more production, grow more wheat and more everything, and manufacture more, and that will help matters". But, unfortunately that advice was taken in this country after the war, and it resulted in adding to the large amount of unsaleable goods on hand, and when that great addition came in the increased production, the wheels of industry stopped and the unemployed masses walked the streets and threateningly challenged the whole basis of civilized order. The next advice which they had to give us is that we consume less.

The CHAIRMAN: The question under consideration by the committee is the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) that section 5 of bill 83 be amended by striking out the words "thirty three" in the fourth and eighteenth lines thereof, and substituting the words "twenty-four" therefor. I do not see the relevancy of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. IRVINE: I think I can show the relevancy, if the Chairman will bear with me for a minute.

The CHAIRMAN: Under the rules speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Mr. IRVINE: I certainly do not want to appear as not speaking to the matter under discussion, but I feel certain in my own mind that I am in order, and if the Chairman will bear with me, I would like to show him the purpose for which I wish to use the argument. I am contending that the industrial condition that is developing before our very eyes is so serious that before another ten years it may threaten the civilized world, that it has a very close connection to finance, that if we pass a Bank Act determining the disposition of money and credit for ten years, the industrial crisis that is brewing may come upon us. I am advancing arguments to show further that the government so far is not aware of the situation and I am offering their own words and opinions as proof that they do not know, I contend that my argument bears directly upon the clause of the bill before the committee. But still, as I develop the point, Mr. Chairman, if you decide it otherwise, just tell me so, and I shall have to abide by your ruling. When the government in power tells the masses of the people that the only solution of the problem is to consume less, then they find that if less is consumed, more goods are left on hand which are unsaleable. Moreover, they find it is difficult to invite people who have not enough to consume now, to consume less. So they abandon that position. Then again they say, "We will fix the situation for the farmer in Canada, not by the Bank Act, but by giving him a foreign market." That is what other governments say. All governments try to console the people by saying that somewhere they are going to find a foreign market which will stimulate trade in the particular country concerned. This foreign market promise does not merely mean the exchange of goods for other goods, but it means that we shall ultimately build up a favourable balance of trade with other nations.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to section 5 of rule 13, which says:

Speeches in committee of the whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

On that clause, I rule that the line of discussion pursued by the hon. member is not strictly relevant to the item under discussion.

Mr. GOOD: On the point of order, it seems to me that in considering the question of whether or not the charters of the banks should be granted for one year or ten years, practically unlimited latitude is necessarily involved. I would very respectfully submit that, in considering a matter of this sort, the widest possible light that can be thrown on any aspect of the financial situation is entirely relevant.

Mr. JACOBS: Would the hon. gentleman from Brant say whether the hon. member for Calgary East should be permitted to talk for one year or for ten years on this question?

Mr. IRVINE: If the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) wishes to limit the hon. member for Calgary East to any specific time, then I would ask him to introduce his closure, but until he does that the hon. member for Calgary East is going to take advantage of the privileges which are offered to hon. members of this House. I am prepared to abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but, perhaps, if I sum up the point I have been leading up to even the Chairman will admit that it is entirely relevant. Here is the summing up. Under the present industrial situation there is not enough being consumed to keep the wheels of production going round. That has transpired, because there is not sufficient purchasing power to enable the people to get all they want to consume. There is not sufficient purchasing power, because we have had a Bank Act in force for ten years, which placed the matter of public credit in the hands of a few individuals. There is the point at issue, and if the Chairman had permitted me I should have marshalled the argument so as to make that connection; but since I am ruled out of order, I leave the conclusion to the committee, and will allow members to use their imagination in developing the argument for themselves. Then, before another ten years, the conflict between science and the money system on the industrial field may possibly have come to a head. Here is the argument. There is a conflict between science as applied to production and the financial system which should function as the distributing agent of what is produced to the consumer. If we pass an act now which fixes for ten years the financial system of Canada, or the handling of the financial system of Canada, and if during that ten years this conflict between science and the financial system should come to a head, then we are due for a collapse, and for that reason I urge that we pass this act for only one year, that we extend the charter for only one year, and that subsequently we prepare, in the light of the industrial conditions that are threatening civilization, a banking act with a view to meeting these conditions, adequately.

Apropos of that point, let me say that the conflict I have mentioned is simply that in the industrial world to-day we have two great factors which tend to displace human agency. The first is the invention of new machines, and we have the application of science in the harnessing of solar or atomic energy. These two factors, combined and applied to the producing system, take the place of human agency. Now, Mr. Chairman, before you rule me out of order, let me show the connection. When solar energy is applied to machinery, or when machines are improved, less human labour is required, and when less labour is required less money will be paid in wages. The money paid out in wages or dividends under the producing system is the extent of the purchasing power of a nation, and the more machinery is applied to the producing system the more human labour is displaced, the less wages will be paid, and therefore the less money will be in circulation. The less purchasing power the nation has in proportion to what is produced, the greater will be unemployment, the more acute will be the industrial problem. For this reason we would not be wise to pass a Bank Act to remain in force for ten years in the face of these developing conditions, so fraught with serious consequences for all the peoples of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. IRVINE: I have no doubt that hon. members opposite are very anxious to carry this measure, but I am not in such a hurry. I am quite prepared to consider the bill before we carry it. Simply because hon. members opposite do not need to give the subject consideration is not an argument for this side of the House failing to see their duty to consider the bill very carefully.

I have one more point to make, Mr. Chairman. It has been referred to already. The evidence taken before the committee on

Banking and Commerce in relation to the bill under discussion has not been considered by that committee. I presumed that that evidence was taken with a view to amending the Bank Act, but I discover now that it was taken merely as a gesture, seemingly to appease the public. But let me assure the public that whether the evidence was of value or not has had no effect whatsoever upon the revision of the Bank Act, indeed, it has not been considered at all in that connection. Now, from that point of view I cannot see why the proceedings should be called a revision of the Bank Act, there has been no revision. The act might just as well have been read over casually and passed. If the evidence taken is to give value for the money expended in taking it, it must at least be considered. If it is going to be considered, it ought to be considered before the act is revised for another ten years. So without belabouring that point overmuch, Mr. Chairman, I urge that as an argument why this act should not be now passed for another ten years.

For the benefit again of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), let me point out to him the three reasons which I have attempted to bring forward why the charters should be granted for one year only. In the first place, I have shown that until the facts are known we cannot amend this act to intelligently meet the weaknesses which must have been inherent in it when the Merchants Bank could be wrecked without anyone being found responsible. We must know what was the cause of that failure; the only way to know is to investigate the circumstances, and the only way to investigate the circumstances is to put this revision off until next year. My second point is that industrial conditions, not only in Canada but universally, are developing with such rapidity that old financial ideas are absolutely incapable of handling the situation, that if we fix our banking system now for another ten years in the face of the speedy change that is taking place before our eyes, we are inviting financial and industrial catastrophe. We ought at least to be in a position to keep an open mind on the question as the changes take place, and be prepared to meet them. In the third place, the Bank Act has not been in any way affected by the weight of evidence which was presented to the committee, that if there was any reason for collecting the evidence concurrently with the revision of the act that reason was presumably that it might in some way affect the wording or change the act. But it could not possibly affect the act in any way if not considered. Therefore I urge that it should be considered before this act is disposed of for ten years.

These are the three reasons I have presented, Mr. Chairman. I could give three more—and I probably will after I have had a rest—but I submit now that these three reasons have to be answered by the hon. member for Halifax or some other worthy representative from the other side before it is necessary for me to advance any further argument. In my estimation what I have urged is sufficient for the carrying of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman).

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Chairman, in the course of the remarks made by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) I had occasion to interrupt and draw his attention to the fact that the Bank Act has been amended on several occasions and in very important particulars between the revision in 1913 and the present day. The hon. gentleman, with that manner which is characteristic of him, brushed my interruption aside with a so-called or alleged joke. He stated that if the act was amended as I claimed it had been, it must have been done at the behest of the Bankers' Association and by the government, which I gathered from his remarks was considered merely a weak instrument in the hands of the Bankers' Association. Now, I should have thought that after fifty sessions, during which this Banking committee functioned—fifty sessions, at most of which the hon. gentleman was heard with great effect—he might have learned something about the Bank Act. But I find that he has not even read the act. In that respect he reminds me of the story of a famous reviewer of books, who said he never read a book before he reviewed it, because if he did it would prejudice him. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman what he thinks of these amendments which were passed after 1913, the date of the last revision.

Mr. IRVINE: Do you ask a question now?

Mr. JACOBS: No, I am making a statement.

Mr. IRVINE: Because I might answer it.

Mr. JACOBS: Take the amendment passed in 1915, two years after the revision:

> The bank may lend money to the owner, tenant, or occupier of land for the purchase of seed grain upon the security of any crop to be grown from such seed grain.

I should like to know in what respect the Bankers' Association only were benefited by that amendment. Again I would refer him to

the amending act of 1916, in which it is stated:

The bank may lend money to a farmer or to any person engaged in stock raising upon the security of his live stock.

I would imagine that these amendments were for the benefit of the party of which he is presumed to be the leader, or one of the leaders. The hon. gentleman, in his very voluble remarks to-night, as on all occasions, reminds me of a cuttlefish. The cuttlefish is a kind of fish which when closely pursued emits a murky fluid from its body, and when the water is thoroughly darkened it escapes. That is the position in which my hon. friend finds himself to-night. Now, I suggest that when he presumes to talk upon the Bank Act—

Mr. IRVINE: What is the connection between my hon. friend's remarks and the point under discussion?

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman talks upon the subject of the Bank Act with the same facility with which he talks on every other question which comes before this House —volubly and at great length. But, as he himself put it somewhat pointedly, when you puncture the bubble, you find there is not very much in it.

Now, the hon. gentleman gives three alleged reasons why this Bank Act should not be proceeded with this year. He spoke about the Merchants Bank and the trouble into which that institution got some time ago— he spoke about it as a failure. Well, I am not going to bandy words with him, but I would like to know what the Merchants Bank, or the failure, if he likes to call it that, has to do with the revision of the Bank Act. After all, the Merchants Bank trouble arose through what was claimed by the department to be failure on the part of the manager to make proper returns as provided in the act. That is all found within one clause of the Bank Act; why hold up the entire Bank Act in order to deal with that particular clause? If it is found later after investigation that there is something in the Bank Act that should not be there or which brought about this trouble in connection with the Merchants Bank, we can easily amend the clause in the act. But to hold up the charters of the seventeen banks of Canada, to interfere with the stability of our financial institutions because of some alleged trouble which arose in connection with the Merchants Bank, is what I would call, if I were not in this House, silly.

Then, the hon. gentleman speaks about the "speedy changes" which are taking place. He says we cannot keep up with the industrial and economic changes which are going on; therefore we should put over the consideration of the Bank Act until next year. Well, will the changes then be any slower? Shall we slow up next year? I do not think we will; but so far as I can see, the speedy changes which are taking place now have no relation at all to the revision of the Bank Act. The Bank Act is the creature of the parliament of Canada, and we can change it whenever we like. We can come here next year, and, by the introduction of a proper measure, completely change the Bank Act, if we find it is not right. But why should we be tied down to passing the law, say next year, which is going to do for the next ten years? The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand; he does not seem to realize that this Bank Act can be changed whenever we wish to change it, and to my mind it is nonsensical for him to talk about its being rigid for the next ten years. This kind of talk may have some effect in the back concessions when my hon. friend appeals to the electors at the proper time, but he cannot make it go down with the hon. members of this House.

Then the hon. gentleman gives a third reason, something which my poor mind refuses to receive. Perhaps it is because it is late in the evening; at any rate, I fail to understand what he means. He says the Bank Act as it exists now is not affected by the weight of evidence which was adduced before the committee. I do not understand that. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would enlighten us before the House adjourns, because I should like to have it go forth that all arguments which the hon. gentleman adduced this evening amounted to nothing. I have already referred to two of them, these, I hope, have been successfully answered; as to the third, I wait for further information from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this all-important subject I wish to say that I intend to support the amendment placed before this committee by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman). To begin with, I would like to take the committee back to what occurred during the last three months in the Banking and Commerce committee. We held very regular sessions, and it occurred to me that any stranger going to that committee might wonder who were the members of parliament and who were the visitors, because it was usually the case that for some time after the hour was called we had as many visitors as we had

members. I say one might wonder who comprised this visiting class. But as we sat in that committee week in and week out we gradually got to know the faces; we realized that they represented people interested in finance. They were representatives of interested banks; they were legal advisers of the bankers—and those legal advisers were not there, I might say, for the benefit of their health. It looked strange to me that when the banking institutions of this country were on their trial, as it were, they should have so much legal support working steadily in the committee.

Mr. JACOBS: I suggest to the hon. gentleman that perhaps they were there to explain to some members of the committee, including the hon. gentleman himself, something about the Bank Act.

Mr. IRVINE: It is a pity the hon. member himself was not there.

Mr. SPENCER: Unfortunately we did not hear very much from the gentlemen I speak of. They reminded me very much of picture shows; you see the movements of the actors, but you do not hear their voices. They passed from member to member; those who were supporting them gave their vote, conscientiously, perhaps, but always on the one side; and that I think, was the reason why those gentlemen who, as I say, were not there for the good of their health, were in their places in the committee day in and day out. I had heard something about an hon. member of this House being called the gramaphone of Mackenzie and Mann, but I never realized the real meaning of that term until I went into the Banking and Commerce committee. Then I realized it in all seriousness, for if there ever was a gramaphone or a continuous hum of gramaphones it was those that played for the Canadian Bankers' Association.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think the hon. member should be allowed to make a remark of that kind with impunity; I think he owes it to the committee to withdraw it. It might very well be retorted of my hon. friend that he is the gramaphone of the United Farmers of Alberta, who directly say to their federal representatives that they must obey the directions of that organization and that they have no right to voice their own opinions in parliament. I might make that statement with truth concerning every hon. gentleman from that province, and they would not be in a position to deny it. I say, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend has no right to make the insinuation which he does against members of parliament.

Mr. SPENCER: I submit that I am on perfectly safe ground. I do not mind the hon. senior member for Halifax calling me the gramaphone of certain interests that I was trying to defend in the Banking committee. I think it is a perfectly proper appellation to give anyone who is supporting a particular cause.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I said the hon. member had no right to take one side or the other; he has to do just what he is told, or be recalled.

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member for Halifax will appreciate the fact that more independent spirit was shown by those members who come from that part of Canada from which I have the honour to come, than by those who come from any other section.

Mr. JACOBS: You admit it.

Mr. SPENCER: There were many tunes, but one song seemed to be continuously played, and that song was: "Why, the system is perfect, so leave it alone." That was the song always sung to us when we tried to make amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that what took place in the committee and the inability of some members to make amendments is not relevant to the particular amendment before the committee.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I shall be pleased to bow to your decision. Perhaps I shall be in order if I refer for a moment to the case of the Merchants Bank, and present that as a reason why we should not now give the banks a charter for ten years. Here is one of the largest banks in Canada which, with very short notice indeed and under very suspicious circumstances, goes to the wall. Some of the largest papers, some of the best known dailies of Canada, demand a full investigation, but no investigation is allowed. We have Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor as a witness before the Banking and Commerce committee, but he is particularly silent in regard to that collapse.

Mr. JACOBS: Was he asked any question about it?

Mr. SPENCER: I will refer the hon .gentleman to the minutes of the Banking and Commerce committee.

Mr. JACOBS: I was present. Let my hon. friend say what questions he was asked in that respect and what his replies were.

Mr. SPENCER: Another gentleman who came before that committee, Sir John Aird, denied the necessity of the Merchants Bank ever losing its identity. Sir Edmund Walker, another gentlemen who came there as a witness, claimed that somebody should have been punished. But later when the question was brought up of giving the committee an opportunity to investigate the matter further, the committee saw fit to refuse to permit that investigation. That is another reason why I am in favour of this amendment, and why I believe we should not grant the charters now for ten years, but rather for one year for the time being.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend propose to ask that a new clause be inserted in the Bank Act providing for an investigation into the affairs of the Merchants Bank?

Mr. SPENCER: No. I did not make that statement. I am going to lay something before the House which I hope will prove that the banking system as it now exists is not giving the required support or filling the needs of the greatest industry in this country. We all know of the vast amount of advertising this country has done in the past to try and get settlers, and settlers of a particular kind, to come to this country. When they come here one of the institutions that they have to deal with, either directly or indirectly, and they can deal with no other if they deal in money at all, is the banking institutions. I am going to bring to the notice of this House a particular case of some people who were brought to this country some thirteen years ago, and who although starting then with the very best of chances have to-day through the actions of our present banking institutions not only gone to the wall, but are willing to get out as soon as they can. I am sure the committee will be interested in hearing read a letter of introduction that I have in my hand from Lord Strathcona. It is written to Mr. J. W. Dafoe, Manitoba Free Press, Winnipeg, Canada. It is sent from 17 Victoria Street, London S. W.

Mr. CANNON: What is the date of the letter?

Mr. SPENCER: The 7th of November, 1910.

Mr. MERCIER: Is that the original?

Mr. JACOBS: Did you find it in the Archives?

Mr. SPENCER: Hon. gentlemen will probably be sorry I did find it by the time I get through. This letter was sent to Mr. Dafoe recommending Mr. T. Hicks who was coming to this country, and this is what Lord Strathcona said:

> This letter will be presented to you by Mr. T. Hicks who sails by the S.S. "Montcalm" on the 9th instant to join two of his sons who are already settled at Sedgwick, Alberta.
>
> Sir Walter Gilbey, Bart., at whose request I furnish this introduction, informs me that Mr. Hicks will prove an acquisition; that he is not only a practical farmer, but an exceptional judge of all stock, and very many thousands of all kinds of stock have been bred and sold by him.
>
> I commend Mr. Hicks to your consideration, and am sure he will much appreciate any advice and assistance you can kindly accord him.
>
> Believe me,
> Your very truly,
> Strathcona.

Mr. Hicks came over to this country with his wife, one daughter and seven sons.

Mr. MERCIER: Have you found anything strange about that letter?

Mr. SPENCER: I will show you the results of it. Mr. Hicks, as you will recognize from this letter of Lord Strathcona, was one of the very best type of settlers that we could possibly get into this country. He came here with his seven sons and started up. He was doing very well, but now I want to read a letter from the reeve of a municipality in the vicinity of Mr. Hicks' place showing what his condition is to-day. He says:

> Please find enclosed letter from Mr. Hicks who is residing close to Provost—

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to come within the rule of relevancy. If he wishes to read the letter of some eminent banker and apply it in his argument on this section that will be in order, but certainly not a letter of introduction.

Mr. SPENCER: This is not a letter of introduction, but a letter from the reeve of a municipality which shows what is happening to the people of this country through the action of the banks, and this man believes that the charters should not be extended for more than one year. He says:

> This is one of the worst cases I have come across, although these last few days I have found several similar but on a smaller scale.
>
> This man Hicks came in with money and established himself on land suitable only for raising stock. By the enclosed letter you will see what the banks have done to him. He happened to be one of the few who had property that the creditors could sacrifice. The debate on the immigration policy showed the government the state that this country is in. I do not need to dwell on that except to say that the people are leaving this district in hundreds, and the

chief thing that is driving them out is the debt and the banks holding a chattel mortgage on everything they possess.

If your committee do not persuade the government to take control of credit out of the hands of private individuals who are using it for their own profit instead of for the good of the country, I tremble for the future of this country. People are freely talking of resistance to these inhuman methods of collecting debt.

I would earnestly suggest that your committee make an investigation into this particular case in the interests of this ruined man and also the balance of the farmers who will be in the same position when there is enough value in the amount of stock they have to make them worth selling.

Yours truly,
Thos. Patridge,
Reeve M. D. of Stewart.

An hon. MEMBER: Is he a banker?

Mr. SPENCER: He would make a very good banker. This is the letter he refers to. This is from Hicks. He says:

In August 1921,—

Mr. CANNON: I rise to a point of order. I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to rule 16 and the decision given under number 202 in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

If we are going to hear letters written fifteen years ago by people in England commenting on the Bank Act I do not know where this debate will end.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not understand the letter is reflecting on the proceedings in this House or denying anything said by an hon. member. I would say that the hon. member has not proceeded sufficiently far for me to give a ruling on his intention.

Mr. SPENCER: I will read this letter. It is from Mr. Hicks, the man referred to. This letter, I may say, is dated April 23rd.

Mr. JACOBS: Not April 1st.

Mr. SPENCER: Is that my hon. friend's birthday? The letter is to the following effect:

In August, 1921, I owed the Merchants Bank at Provost $3,900. They made me give a chattel mortgage on 100 horses, 100 cattle, 250 sheep; amongst the horses were 2 valuable percheron studs worth $3,000. I bought them as colts for $1,800. I paid $900, and I owed $900. I said I had better not include them as I must sell one to pay the $900, but the manager promised if I included them they would pay the note when asked. I thought this fair so they were included. In the fall of 1921 I sold my beef cattle for about $540. This I paid in. Early in 1922 the bank asked for another $1,000. I had nothing saleable, but at last they made me sell my ewes. They explained not many farmers kept ewes and they were not necessary; anyone could farm without them. Well they worried them out of me.

[Mr. Spencer.]

I would like to point out to the committee that this man was worth $28,000 in total assets; his liabilities amounted to about $4,000. That is the reason I am bringing the case to the attention of the committee: The bankers are not giving even to substantial people a fair show under present conditions. That is the reason why I am asking the bank charters be only granted for one year. Now referring to sheep he said:

I made $6.75 each. A total of $1,284; 164 were ewes in lamb, remainder wethers. The ewes were just lambing. They were all shipped to Vancouver and slaughtered. I started with 10 ewes in 1911. I used a pedigree ram every year, so they had 10 crosses of pure blood in them, and they were in lamb by 2 rams; cost me $112. The drover who took them through and had them killed said there were 207 large lambs in them, lambs made $7 each here last fall.

I may say that the total for the lambs would have been $1,449 or more than the sheep yielded.

Just after I sold the ewes the man asked for the note for the studs. I went to the bank for the money, but the manager said they did not want to let out any new money, but as I had lots of horses if I had a sale he would settle the note. I had a sale Ap. 1, 1922, I was very ill at the time, my son managed the sale. It was at Provost. When he returned he said the manager sent word "as you are ill you are not to worry at all about the stud note, he will fix it all up for you." A month after the man wrote to say he had not received any money. I sent his letter to the bank and the manager wrote saying they could not pay all the note but he would send $500. Another month went, the man wrote the bank about it as he had had not received any money. The manager actually replied saying I had drawn the money and spent it, but I never had a dollar. The man then went to the Chief Office, Calgary. They admitted that the manager had done wrong, but yet they would not think about paying his stud note, but they agreed to liberate the studs off their mortgage and advised the man to claim them. I had no choice, no voice in the matter. The man came after the studs 3 weeks ago. He gave me the note and a poor specimen of a 2-year old stud with a large hock and bad front joint which he hits every time he walks. I had to pay $30 freight on him and that is about his value. The man took my studs right to Calgary Fair and took first prize in all age class, beating George Lane. . . . he was also reserve champion both places. His name is (Milton of Acme) Some people, good judges too, value him at $3,000. It has to be a good horse to take 1st at Calgary. I showed him at the Provost Fair in 1921 and 1922 and took 1st both years and champion horse at the show.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that it is doubtful whether a long recital of some difficulties a farmer had with an individual bank manager has any relevancy to the general principle of whether the bank charters should be extended for one year or ten years.

Mr. SPENCER: To meet your wishes I will—

The CHAIRMAN: I am not giving a ruling at present. I am just suggesting to

the hon. member that there is doubt in my mind as to whether the matter he is reading is relevant to the question.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like to read the following letter—

Mr. JACOBS: The letter does not appear to be accompanied by an affidavit.

Mr. SPENCER: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the letter is signed and furthermore to satisfy hon. members opposite I may say here is another letter from the same man received a few days ago. He says:

I would like the case made public. Don't put initials down or say a man in the West, but tell exact my name and address, besides the bank causing me to lose $3,000 in actual cash.

I hope that will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it the Merchants Bank he had dealings with?

Mr. PUTNAM: Is the hon. member always so easily satisfied with the insolvent's own account of how he came to go to the wall?

Mr. SPENCER: I did not quite catch my hon. friend's question. This man was pressed absolutely unnecessarily by the bank. He had several times the amount of assets that he had liabilities with the bank, and several times they broke their promise to him. The bank saw fit to remove their manager and they have not thought fit to make good to Hicks up to the present time.

Mr. PUTNAM: I suppose the hon. gentleman knows, as a matter of general practice that an insolvent generally gives a one-sided account of how he came to go to the wall; he generally puts the blame upon the other fellow.

Mr. SPENCER: I would like to say that I have had this case corroborated from five different sources and my informants are all very reliable men.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. gentleman not think that inasmuch as it was the Merchants Bank that was concerned, the rule "Speak nothing but good of the dead" ought to apply?

Mr. SPENCER: With the Merchants Bank this man had very reasonable treatment. But the Montreal Bank treated him as I have stated.

I should like to read a very short account from a local paper as follows:

District court sitting held May 17th.

This is in regard to the same bank.

A very interesting case was decided at the sitting of the district court which was held in Provost last Thursday before His Honor Judge Lees. The case was at the suit of Lambert Haan against the Bank of Montreal.

Haan alleged that the Provost manager of the defendant bank had agreed to pay his thresh bill on some 1,400 bushels of wheat which the bank had received. The bank denied making the agreement and claimed that for various reasons Haan's threshing lien was invalid. The court, however; held both that the agreement had been made and that Haan's threshing lien was in order and gave Haan judgment against the bank for the amount of his claim and costs.

Mr. PUTNAM: Was there any appeal?

Mr. SPENCER: No appeal that I know of. I wish to draw the attention of the committee to another case to show what satisfaction, what service, the people of that particular province are getting from the banks at the present time. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated this evening that the farmers of western Canada had borrowed too liberally. Would it not be just as fair to say that the banks in western Canada had lent too liberally, and that the fault on the part of the farmers is only equal to the fault on the part of the banks?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will my hon. friend allow me to suggest that he cannot prove or disprove everything by citing individual instances of what, perhaps, are real hardships suffered by a borrower on the part of a bank. We might admit that the case to which my hon. friend referred just a moment ago was one in which the borrower, perhaps, did not receive fair treatment.

Mr. STEVENS: That was admitted.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, and the bank manager was suspended. Might the same thing not happen in any country in the world and under any banking system? Does my hon. friend think he is contributing anything to the debate by referring to instances of this kind?

Mr. SPENCER: I am very glad the hon. member for Halifax has brought this point to my notice, because in a very few minutes I am going to bring confirmation from many other sources along the same lines.

The CHAIRMAN: I am going to tell the hon. member that it is not relevant to the particular subject matter under discussion for him to do that. There is a definite resolution before the committee, and the debate has gone rather beyond that this evening. The question is whether the bank charters shall be renewed for ten years or for one year. Reasons may be given why they should not be, but individual instances of failures, of loans,

of insolvencies, cannot possibly be a reason why there should not be a renewal of the charters for either ten years or one year.

Mr. SPENCER: I will try to keep within your ruling. I am in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) because of the notice I have in my hand, which, in my opinion, proves that there is something radically wrong with our financial system in that it has allowed the country to get into the state in which it is at present. I am reading now a few lines from the Alberta Gazette, part 2, dated Edmonton, Tuesday, May 25, 1923. It is headed:

Notice under the Tax Recovery Act, Department of Municipal Affairs, Province of Alberta.

Notice is hereby given that proceedings have been begun under the Tax Recovery Act, 1922, against the following lands in the improvement districts in the South Alberta land registration district, and unless the lands named herein are redeemed before the 14th day—

The CHAIRMAN: How can the hon. member contend that this tax notice is relevant to the particular amendment that has been moved?

Mr. SPENCER: If you will allow me half a minute—

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to have a reason because, in my opinion, it is clearly irrelevant.

Mr. SPENCER: The very fact that there are advertised in this Gazette no less than 2,207,360 acres of land for sale, is proof that something is wrong, and I contend that our financial system is wrong. If our financial system is wrong, I do not see why we should give the banks a charter for ten years.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member is in order in reading a tax notice.

Mr. SPENCER: I will come to the last matter that I will bring to the notice of the committee. We on this side of the House have made certain statements during this session in the Chamber and in the various committees, and these statements have been, at least, very much doubted, if not denied. To be sure that the statements we were making were correct, I sent out a questionnaire in regard to banking in order to find out the relationship between the banks and the people throughout a very large constituency. I have a synopsis of this, and I am going to read it—it is short—because it is a reason why we should extend these charges for only one year at the present time. The heading of the questionnaire I sent out reads:

I will be very much obliged to you if you will at your earliest convenience fill in the answers below in as accurate a manner as possible. I would ask you to make your estimates, when in doubt rather conservative than otherwise, so that I may be sure of being within the truth in any use that I may make of the information.

[The Chairman.]

The first question reads:

What bank or banks are in your vicinity?

The banks included in the answers were the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Commerce, the Royal Bank, the Union Bank, the Bank of Toronto, and the Hochelaga Bank. The second question reads:

What is the average term of farmers' notes in months?

The answer was: Three and a half months. Imagine an industry that has a turnover usually only once in twelve months, having to renew its obligations every three and a half months! The third question reads:

Do you consider this a long enough term?

One hundred per cent said. No, decidedly not. The fourth question reads:

What is the average interest charged?

Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, chairman of the Bankers' Association, when giving evidence before the Banking and Commerce committee, stated at first that he thought the average throughout western Canada was 7 per cent, and later he raised that to 7 or 8. In this instance, if we strike an average, the rate comes between 8 and 9 per cent. I want to give the committee just the facts. The fifth question reads:

Does the bank charge what is usually known as bankers' discount, that is, deduct interest from a note prior to money being given to borrower?

Eighty-eight per cent of the answers were: Yes; twelve per cent were: No. The sixth question reads:

About what month are notes dated to become due?

The answers were that notes are renewed every few months, but they are forced to meet their notes in the fall, very often at the expense of having to sell their products on a falling market. The seventh question reads:

Is this beneficial to agriculture?

As the committee will understand, the answer was one hundred per cent: No. The eighth question reads:

Have many caveats been issued against grain which prevented the farmer from getting his money at the elevator?

Twenty per cent of them say: Yes; eighty per cent say: No. I might say that in one of the answers that was "yes," they said "Yes, over one hundred caveats were issued at the local elevator." The ninth question reads:

Did the farmers borrow heavily to buy feed for the cattle during the winter of 1919-20?

Or otherwise the hard winter. Ninety-two per cent said that they did, and only eight per cent said that they did not. The tenth question reads:

Did the banks in the spring of 1920 encourage farmers to buy stock, because in their opinion they would rise in value?

Eighty-four per cent answered yes, and sixteen per cent answered no. The eleventh question reads:

Did your bank try to force farmers at a later date to sell cattle bought on their advice, even if said stock had to be sold at a loss?

Seventy-six per cent answered yes, eight per cent answered no, and sixteen per cent did not send a return. The twelfth question is:

Was this a general practice?

Fifty-six per cent answered yes, sixteen per cent answered no, twelve per cent answered some, and sixteen did not answer. The thirteenth question reads:

What percentage of satisfaction is the bank giving to your district?

This is rather interesting to the committee. Fifty-two per cent answered "Not very good." Thirty-two per cent say "None at all." Twelve per cent say they are getting some service, and four per cent send no reply.

Mr. DUFF: What class of people gave those answers?

Mr. SPENCER: The class of people such as Lord Strathcona—

Mr. DUFF: He is dead now. What class of people made those answers? Lord Strathcona is in heaven.

Mr. SPENCER: Men qualified to run a business.

Mr. DUFF: What class of people made those answers?

Mr. SPENCER: The clients of the bank.

Mr. DUFF: Were they business men or professional men?

Mr. SPENCER: Business farmers.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to know how the hon. member can make all these questions relevant to the particular matter before the committee. I cannot see the relevancy. I do not like to rule the hon. member out of order.

Mr. SPENCER: I do not wish to go against the ruling of the Chair, but I think this is very valuable information.

The CHAIRMAN: That is no reason why it should be introduced in this discussion. It must be relevant.

Mr. SPENCER: This questionnaire was sent to find out the feeling between the people and the bank, and whether they were willing that the charter should be granted for ten years.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant to this particular amendment.

Mr. SPENCER: The answers I am giving are the reasons why I am voting that the charter be extended for one year only at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: These questions and answers are altogether irrelevant, with one exception perhaps.

Mr. SPENCER: I have a few more questions. The fourteenth question reads:

Has your bank requested payment of their clients' liabilities in full, with the promise of extension of credit?

Eighty-four per cent answered yes, and sixteen do not reply at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I am going to rule that question out of order.

Mr. SPENCER: I am very sorry that that is the Chairman's ruling, but I will just give the House the last one.

Mr. GOOD: May I speak—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. GOOD: May I speak to the point of order. I would like to submit that if the hon. member for Battle River shows, as he is attempting to show, I think, that the banks in western Canada are not giving satisfaction, that is relevant to the question of whether or not the charters should be extended one year or ten years. It seems to be absolutely relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer to Denison's Decisions, where I find the following:

A general argument on a bill cannot be allowed on a particular clause.

Mr. Speaker rules that the question at present being whether this particular clause should pass a general argument can hardly be allowed upon the question.

I am reading from Denison, page 56. There is no question as to the rules. In committee the discussion must be relevant to the particular question or clause or amendment under discussion, and a statement as to conditions industrially or otherwise in different

parts of the country have only a remote bearing on it, and not a direct bearing which would be necessary to bring it within the rules.

Mr. GOOD: I submit there has been no opportunity given for debating this bill in the House. It received the second reading formally. It was referred to the committee. There was plenty of opportunity for discsussion in committee, but there has been no opportunity in the House. Our move this afternoon was ruled out of order. We are reduced to this position: Are we going to be ruled out of order—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee why, if he had any fundamental objection to the measure, it was not brought forward on the second reading when the whole question could be discussed?

Mr. GOOD: I think I can answer the question frankly. The Minister of Finance stated on that occasion, if my recollection is correct, that he desired the fullest possible discussion in the committee and he hoped the second reading would go through without discussion, and it went through.

Mr. FIELDING: The motion was that it be referred to the committee on Banking and Commerce, and I suggested that there should be the fullest discussion there, and we had the fullest discussion in that committee.

Mr. SPENCER: I will not go against the ruling. I will not give the House what I consider is a lot of valuable information. I assure this House and the committee, that if they are going to shut their eyes to the conditions that exist, they will wake some day to a scene that they will be very sorry to see.

Mr. FIELDING: Do not threaten us.

Mr. BIRD: I would like to raise a point of order. I refer to page 68 of Beauchesne's Rules, section 248, which reads:

> Whilst a member is addressing the House no one has a right to interrupt him by putting a question to him or by making or demanding an explanation. A member will at times allow such interruptions through a sense of courtesy to another, but it is entirely at the option of the member in possession of the floor to give way or not to an immediate explanation.

Then again at page 75—

> A member must not interrupt any member who is speaking by disorderly noises or in any other manner.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question about the rule being a correct one.

[The Chairman.[

Mr. BIRD: I think the rule I have read has the specific application at the present moment.

Mr. SPENCER: If I had not been interrupted I would have been through about ten minutes ago. Does the Chairman rule me out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can answer questions put to him if he wishes, but if he does not desire to answer questions he need not do so.

Mr. BIRD: If I may be allowed to pursue that, there has been a continual fire of questions—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. BIRD: I draw the Chairman's attention to the fact that throughout the speech of the hon. gentleman there has been an uninterrupted fire of questions and inarticulate comments, which I think altogether unjustified, in view of the rules I have read to the House just now.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask hon. members to permit the hon. gentleman who is speaking to continue without interruption.

Mr. SPENCER: You do not rule me out of order in regard to this information I am trying to give?

The CHAIRMAN: On the questions and answers, yes.

Mr. SPENCER: All right, I will abide by your ruling. I just want to say that these questionnaires and answers disclose conditions in the country from which we come that no member of the House can afford to ignore. I wish to tell the House—and this is relevant to the point at issue—that with the enormous sums of money that this country is spending year in and year out in trying to bring people to this country, that questionnaires prove that we are losing people in vast numbers, and that the few that are returning are simply renting. I would remind hon. members that these replies show a mortgage indebtedness in the county that most of them would refuse to credit. It is because the people there have not got the sympathetic ear of the financial institutions which enjoy a monopoly, that they are crying out for relief. And when we, their representatives, put the case fairly and squarely before this House what reception do we get? We simply get ruled out of order, ridiculed, laughed at—anything but sympathy. But we are not looking for sympathy, we are looking for justice. One of the things that we are asking in justice to

our people is that these bank charters should be renewed for one year only, to give us an opportunity of reviewing the vast amount of evidence that has been placed before the committee.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has stated that hon. gentlemen who were putting forward amendments before the Banking and Commerce committee, were advancing something that was not of very great value. He may not have thought our suggestions were of very great value, but the hon. members who sponsored them thought they were, and put a great deal of time on their preparation. I would point out that one of the reasons why we should have these charters extended for one year only for the time being, is because of the fact that the greater percentage of the arguments we put forward in favour of our amendments were ignored, and the amendments were turned down by a silent vote. As an instance, take section 91 in regard to interest. Masses of evidence were adduced why, if we are to have a clause regulating the rate of interest, there should be a penalty for any attempt to exact anything in excess of the stipulated rate. Very few spoke against the proposal, I think only two members, yet when it came to a vote, however convincing the arguments put forward might have been, they failed to influence the committee, and the amendment was defeated by the silent vote which never failed to function on such occasions.

Mr. DUFF: It showed their good sense.

Mr. SPENCER: It may have, but it showed that they had not the good sense to speak to the question. The hon. member for Halifax also stated—and I was very sorry to hear him, because personally I have a very great regard for him—that foolish and dangerous ideas had been put forward. I cannot understand why he should make that statement in view of the fact that so few of these so-called foolish and dangerous ideas were considered. At any rate, if that was his opinion as the chairman of the committee, it was natural that he would not be in favour of them. He asserted that ample and due consideration was given to all amendments. I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with him In the last few days some very important amendments were put forward, in some cases without the slightest criticism being offered against them, indeed, with several members of the committee speaking in their favour, but those amendments were solidly turned down by the silent vote.

It is for these reasons, and for many others that I could mention if I cared to take up any more time of the committee, that I am in favour of, and intend to vote for, this amendment that the charters be extended for one year only.

Mr. McBRIDE: It was not my intention to say anything on this subject to-night, but it seems to me that a change of programme would be acceptable to the House. Now, I have been thirty-one years in this country and have been doing business with the banks off and on during that time, and I have always found them ready to do what was right. I have always got money when I wanted it, and at a fair rate of interest; and when I had any money to deposit I always got a fair rate of interest. The fault with most people at the present time is that they want to start in at the top of the ladder. They do not want to do as men did thirty years ago,—work to get a start. The fault of many people is that they borrow all the money they can get, and instead of repaying it when they sell their crop they will go and buy an auto and run around the country. I state the facts of the case.

As I have already said, I have no fault to find with the banking system, and I think it is up to the House to give an extension of the bank charters for ten years in order to create business stability in the country. If we begin extending the charters from year to year, what confidence will any person have in the country? It is going to do harm, and, I repeat, I think it is up to the House to extend the charters for another ten years. If a certain class of people want loans there are other means of securing them.

Mr. DUFF: They have not got any security to give.

Mr. McBRIDE: If they have the security they can get all the loans they want without any trouble. I have always found that if you do the right thing with the banks, the banks will do the right thing with you. If I have any fault to find with the banks at all it is that they are too free with their money. I believe that the curse of this country to-day is too much borrowing and not enough production. If people would only work for what they want it would be better for the Dominion as a whole.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, as there are a number of other members who wish to speak to the question, I would suggest that it might be advisable to adjourn the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. GOOD: I am prepared to go ahead, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that the amendment is very reasonable indeed. We are accepting the revision so far as it has been accomplished up to date, and we are simply asking that the charters be granted for one year, so that between now and next session we may have an opportunity to study the mass of evidence dealing with the whole question of our financial and banking system. It seems to me that the government would be well advised to consent to such a fair and moderate suggestion.

I had intended to speak at some length, but there will be other opportunities for dealing with certain phases of the subject that I wish to take up, and therefore I will content myself for the present by simply pointing out very briefly the situation that faces us to-day. There is no doubt that Canada, along with many other nations, is in a very serious condition. This is doubtless partly due to the war—how much it is hard to say; but whether it is due to one cause or another the condition is admittedly serious. Now, in the face of that condition; in face of the fact that a very large volume of evidence has been submitted to the committee; in face of the fact that a number of other amendments have been suggested to the bill by members of the committee; in face of the fact that a number of further investigations, such as that into the Merchants Bank fiasco, have been demanded by members of the committee, the government apparently propose to wash their hands of the whole affair; to clean up, so to speak, and enact legislation for another ten years. I submit that that is a very dangerous procedure. It has been admitted by a good many members of the committee on all sides after hearing the evidence that, possibly, very fundamental changes in our financial system will be necessary during the next ten years. If that is so, surely we would be well advised if we simply granted the charters for one year, meanwhile looking into the evidence so that next year we shall be in a position to decide what should be done.

I want to make one or two remarks on the Merchants Bank case. There has been a good deal of confusion of mind regarding the motion that was moved in the Banking and Commerce committee some time ago respecting this matter. The purpose of the proposed investigation is not to again try Mr. Macarow and the others. They were indicted on a certain specific charge; they were tried, and they were acquitted. So far as the wrongdoing is concerned, nobody knows who is to blame. Evidently there was some falsification of returns. We have a situation which I think is almost without a parallel. The trial has come off, somebody must have been guilty, but we do not know who. The purpose of the proposed investigation is not to try these men over again but to get from men who know the inside of this affair information that is highly necessary if the various clauses of the Bank Act, especially those having to do with inspection, returns, and so on, are to be properly drafted so that the future may be safeguarded. I submit that the calling of Mr. Macarow, the general manager of the Merchants Bank, would be entirely in order, entirely proper; and the turning down of that suggestion in the committee created in my mind grave suspicions as to what lay behind the action, particularly in view of rumours that have been circulated regarding the affair. I do not know what truth there was in these rumours, but in view of the circumstances; in view of the mystery surrounding a number of these matters, it was entirely in order that these men should come here and give any information that members of the House should think fit to ask them to furnish.

Mr. DUFF: What are your suspicions?

Mr. GOOD: I do not propose to be led into that to-night.

Mr. DUFF: Because you have not any.

Mr. GOOD: I have.

Mr. DUFF: Why not tell us what they are?

Mr. GOOD: They have already been referred to in the discussion. I am not going to deal at length with the Merchants Bank case to-night.

Further there is great need in Canada for some rural credit legislation. We do not know at present how far this may be worked out independently of our present banking system or how far it may be necessary to link it up with the latter. Therefore, until we have something more definite, more concrete, more specific with regard to the whole question of rural credits, in my opinion it would be the wisest thing to give a temporary extension of the charters of the Canadian banks, and then if any changes are desirable between now and next year when we have the report of the committee on rural credits and when the matter can be gone into to some extent, we shall be in a very much better position to decide what should be done. There is no doubt that this is a matter that needs immediate attention; it has been admitted in the committee by men on all sides that that is the case. It is therefore, a very fair proposal indeed that until this matter takes shape we

should not give any very considerable extension to the bank charters under the present terms.

In addition to that there has been submitted to the committee, but hardly discussed at all, the question of a federal reserve bank. This is a most important question not only as it relates to our present banking system, but also as it may be linked up with the whole question of rural credits and smaller banks. We shall have to give it some consideration. I am inclined to think from what little information I have on the question that it is almost a necessary part of a rural credit system. This thing is as yet undiscussed, uninvestigated by the committee.

I submit also that the whole question of co-operative banking, which has been so successful elsewhere, is something we ought to consider before our financial system is crystallized in its present shape for another ten years.

We heard something in the committee also about the Australian Commonwealth Bank, a government bank in Australia which seems to have given a great deal of satisfaction. This, too, in its possible application to the Canadian financial system has not received any consideration; it has been mentioned once or twice, but we have not had time to look into the matter.

There is another matter which in my judgment is one of prime importance, concerning which I had intended to speak at some length. I shall only refer to it now; I will leave the discussion of the stabilizing of the purchasing power of money until we reach the clause on interest, where I think it may appropriately be brought up again. But this is one of the most vital questions in the entire field of economics. The whole world has suffered tremendously in recent years from fluctuations in the purchasing power of money. Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale University, who has evolved a plan for the stabilizing of the purchasing power of money, gave evidence before the committee. But it has not been discussed by the committee, although it is very closely linked up with our whole banking system, so far as the control of interest rates is in some degree a means of stabilizing prices. Moreover it has already been stated that a number of representative bodies throughout Canada have asked that the charters be extended for just one year so that time may be afforded for examination of the evidence which has been submitted. As the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) said not very long ago, there are a great many members of this House who have not been privileged to attend the meetings and follow the evidence, who have not had time yet even to read it, and who, I think, should not be called upon to express themselves in a vote at the present time in any final way. I think they would appreciate very much the opportunity which a year's extension of the bank charters would give them to look into this evidence which has been placed on record. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to say something that is not very pleasant to say, but I think perhaps it is necessary. I have seen some things this year that I never thought I would see in a Canadian parliament and I must say that my faith in the sincerity and integrity of people who have the control of policy has been somewhat shattered by what I have seen this year. I do not like to make a statement like that, but I think perhaps I had better.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): If the reflection is intended for a member of the House, the hon. member's remark is certainly out of order.

Mr. GOOD: I will say no more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DUFF: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MARLER: What does the hon. member mean? Why talk in this cryptic way? Have we got integrity in this House or in the committee or have we not?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I think the hon. member on consideration will admit that applying such a term to gentlemen who are in control of policy in this House is certainly unparliamentary. The expression had better be withdrawn.

Mr. GOOD: I will explain myself, Mr. Chairman, if hon. gentlemen wish me to.

Mr. MARLER: Go ahead. Do not talk in innuendoes all the time.

Mr. DUFF: Explain.

Mr. GOOD: I want to mention one matter, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DUFF: You could not back up your statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): If necessary I can read the hon. member the rule of the House. I think that his words should be withdrawn.

Mr. GOOD: Then I will withdraw at your request, Mr. Chairman. During the hearings of the committee we learned just about enough from the accountant, Mr. Edwards, who made some partial investigation into the Merchants

Bank affair, to make it very necessary indeed to carry out a fuller investigation. I would like to recall the evidence he submitted in connection with his partial investigation. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said during the course of his remarks that bank failures cannot be prevented by legislation. Now I want very respectfully to call that statement in question. What is the purpose of the efforts that we have made this year on the committee to stop some of the loopholes, to remedy some of the defects, if it is not to make more difficult such failures as have taken place in the past?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I said that.

Mr. GOOD: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member left a very different impression on some members of the committee. He did on my mind at all events.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I said it was our duty to strengthen our legislation so as to make failures as difficult as possible to occur, but I did express the view that I did not think legislation would make absolutely impossible bank failures or any other kind of failures.

Mr. GOOD: I am very glad to have this explanation from the hon. member because I think now he and I agree absolutely in regard to this matter. The purpose of our legislation is to make these things more difficult to occur. Of course, everybody admits that you cannot remedy the defects or frailties of human nature altogether by legislation, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that legislation can do a great deal in many directions for assisting in that particular way.

The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) wanted to know what the Merchants Bank affair had to do with this Bank Act. I would like to reply to that question in this way: If we do not know, as we do not at the present time, what lay behind that situation we cannot take the necessary precautions except in so far as we may apply general rules to provide safeguards—

Mr. CHURCH: May I ask the hon. member a question? I have never been a supporter of Canada's banking system, but I would ask the hon. member for Brant this question. I understand he is one of the directors and vice-president of the United Farmers of Ontario Co-operative stores. Would he mind reading to the committee a report of the meeting at Toronto last fall of the shareholders of the United Farmers Co-operative stores, which have been far from a success to their shareholders, and tell the committee why he did not apply the advice he is giving now in the administration of these stores? We had a Farmers Bank in Toronto in which 2,690 widows and orphans lost their all. The bank was run on theory and such lines as the hon. gentleman talks of. Will he please read to the committee the press report on the row at the United Farmers of Ontario Co-operative stores meeting last fall and the result of the failure of the Farmers Bank?

Mr. GOOD: I am afraid that is rather a large contract for me at this hour of the night. I wish to submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is no clear idea present before the committee at this moment as to how far the Bank Act may be changed at any time. The statement has been made that it can be amended at any time. Now, how far is that true? If it is true that fundamental changes may be made at any time, if it is true that the significance of granting a ten-year charter is practically nothing at all, then of course there is no practical difference between the granting of charters for one year and the granting of charters for ten years, but I do submit that unless we are going to interpret the granting of ten-year charters differently from what we have understood in the past, it is entirely unwise and improper under present conditions, and in view of all these questions which have been presented to the committee and which the country has to solve in some way or other in the near future—it is entirely unwise, I say, to crystallize in any way the financial system by granting ten-year charters.

This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, an effort was made to move the following amendment which I would like to put on Hansard in connection with the Merchants Bank affair:

Whereas the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce decided by resolution not to hear evidence dealing with the collapse of the Merchants Bank, and its subsequent amalgamation or merger with the Bank of Montreal;

Mr. CHURCH: May I ask the hon. member if he will kindly answer the question I put to him: Why does he not apply the same principle he is advocating here to the United Farmers of Ontario Co-operative stores?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: Make him speak.

Mr. CHURCH: Will the hon. member answer the question?

Mr. GOOD (Reading):

And whereas it is in the public interest that the conditions which led to or were connected with said collapse should be made public, in order that any weaknesses and deficiencies in the existing Bank Act may be remedied, and the interests of depositors, shareholders, and the general public may be safeguarded.

Mr. FIELDING: I draw attention to the fact that the motion the hon. gentleman is reading has no relation to the clause under discussion.

Mr. GOOD: I submit that it is entirely relevant to the question of the Merchants Bank.

Mr. FIELDING: The Merchants Bank case is not before the committee.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing the Merchants Bank and its collapse at considerable length to-night and have been urging that the investigation of the affairs of that bank is related to the propriety or impropriety of granting bank charters for one year or for ten years. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution is entirely in order as expressing the demand for an investigation. It simply states in brief form that the demand for an investigation should be granted before the bank charters are extended for more than one year.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): According to parliamentary practice a general argument cannot be allowed upon a particular clause. An amendment is now before the committee to which the hon. member must address himself and the rule as to relevancy therefore applies. The question is as to whether the words "twenty-four" should be substituted for the words "thirty-three" in the fourth line. Argument such as my hon. friend is indulging in is altogether irrelevant.

Mr. GOOD: I think it has been conceded to-night that the demand for an investigation into the Merchants Bank is debatable under this clause we are discussing.

The CHAIRMAN: The moment objection was taken I gave a ruling. The point may not have been raised before but the moment it was raised I ruled that it was well taken.

Mr. GOOD: Do I understand that I am ruled out of order in reading this resolution?

The CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant to the motion or to the amendment before the Chair as far as I can see.

Mr. GOOD: I submit it is entirely relevant.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. RINFRET: There has been a ruling by the Chair.

Mr. GOOD: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, if you so rule.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that it is not relevant to the subject under discussion.

Mr. GOOD: As I mentioned some time ago I intended to deal at some length, during the course of this debate, with the stabilization of the price level but I can do that under another heading. As there are a number of other members who wish to speak on the subject of granting bank charters I shall leave my remarks for a future occasion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow-River): Mr. Chairman, very much of what I desire to say had I been able to speak earlier in the evening has already been said, but I wish to join my voice with those who are protesting against the jamming through of this bill for ten years at the present session. I share the opinion of hon. members in this quarter of the Chamber who have held that a proper investigation must be made into the Merchants Bank case before the House, or a committee of the House, is competent to deal with the Bank Act in a manner that the public of this country desire as the result of the fiasco that has been witnessed. No due consideration has been given to the mass of evidence adduced before the committee. That point has also been raised by hon. members sitting round me and I share the opinion of those who have made known their views upon it.

There was a refusal during the last few days of the sittings of the committee on Banking and Commerce to investigate or to discuss the Federal Reserve system of the United States. I should like to call the attention of this House to the answer of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) when this question came up. He said: "It is not worth calling witnesses half a mile, that all the evidence, all the stuff that was required, could be secured in the library." What an extraordinary statement to be made by an opponent of an investigation into the Federal Reserve system of the United States, one of the greatest and one of the most famous systems in the world, "that you could find all the information about it in the library". Why did we go into committee to deal with this matter if you could find all about it in the library? Why discuss anything if you could find all about it in the library. That is one of the chief arguments of those who seem to be particularly interested in passing the Bank Act this session. Now, the refusal to investigate the Merchants Bank case by that committee—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): —has been in my opinion one of the most disastrous things the Liberal party has ever perpetrated in this country, and it will react to the

discredit of the Liberal party everlastingly. There will be protests by the people of this country in a short time that will astonish hon. members sitting opposite. They, perhaps, cannot yet conceive the immense feeling that is already gaining ground in connection with the matter.

Mr. DUFF: Where is it?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I read from the Montreal Star of April 28, 1923, an expression of opinion on the subject:

> The sudden wreckage of the Merchants Bank shocked the people of Canada. Even yet they do not fully understand what happened. They are not convinced that it was necessary to close the doors on an ancient and honourable institution and have its assets turned over to a rival. It is true that the shareholders suffered most and that there is no more reason to protect holders of bank shares than those who invest in other enterprises, but the whole banking system was put under suspicion by a collapse and an absorption for causes which are still imperfectly understood and as to which no explanation has been offered which has seemed to be adequate.

On this ground of lack of information alone, an investigation of the Merchants Bank case, in conjunction with the whole discussion of the Bank Act, should have been taken by the committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. JACOBS: May I be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. RINFRET: Does my hon. friend believe in the Montreal Star?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I suggest to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier most quietly and respectfully that the very ethics of his profession ought to have been sufficient to have prevented him from interrupting me when I was discussing the Merchants Bank case, seeing that the hon. member, I understand, was attorney for one of the parties in the case.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not take lessons in ethics from the hon. member for Bow-legged River, or whatever his constituency is.

Mr. GARDINER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has just made a reference to the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Garland), which should be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gordon): I did not understand the hon. member to reflect on Mr. Garland's integrity.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I ask my hon. friend from Medicine Hat not to deal too drastically with the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, but rather to sympathize with him.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. RINFRET: Take your medicine.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In regard to the investigation into the Merchants Bank fiasco another question arose—apart altogether from that appalling collapse itself—in the minds of the public, and that was the question of mergers. But before I pass on to that I would like to quote, as another reason why the bank charters should not be renewed for ten years at the present session, a statement from the Canadian Annual Review, 1921. The quotation, I can assure hon. members will not be lengthy. I have no more desire than they have to prolong this discussion, but I do desire to put myself on record on this important question. At page 40 of the Canadian Annual Review of 1921, after a lengthy and very clearly defined statement of the history and standing of the Merchants Bank, the following is written:

> On December, 16 Montreal heard with astonishment and the country with absolute amazement that the chairman of the Montreal Stock Exchange had received from Sir Montague Allan, president of the bank, the following letter:
>
> "You are requested herewith to withdraw Merchants Bank of Canada stock from your list as arrangements have been made with the Bank of Montreal, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council and the shareholders of both banks, to take over the Merchants Bank."

Mr. JACOBS: I rise to a point of order. Is it relevant for the hon. member to read this matter before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: I should not like to give a ruling until the reading proceeds a little further.

Mr. CANNON: On the point of order, in justice to the hon. member for Brant, (Mr. Good), I might say that it was decided a short while ago that the hon. member for Brant had no right to discuss the Merchants Bank. If the hon. member who now has the floor has that right, the hon. member for Brant should be recalled and given an opportunity of discussing the question.

Mr. GARLAND: (Bow River): Hear, hear; I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for your permission to continue in the matter, and I submit that the recent failure or fiasco of the Merchants Bank, involving the question of suspicion, and it did inevitably give rise to suspicion in the minds of the people of Canada, and as a consequence of which there should be some very drastic changes in the Bank Act, changes which, in my opinion, have not yet been made, is one of the reasons why this revision should be deferred.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member not anticipating a future clause in the bill which provides for forms of returns, the necessity of returns and signatures of certain officials? I am just drawing that to the attention of the hon. member. I fear he is anticipating another clause.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not think so, for this reason: In the discussion of clause 5 and the amendment thereto, I frankly confess that I cannot see how any aspect of banking or the banking system cannot be made relevant to the question. It is true that on other questions some of these matters would be utterly out of order. For instance, on the interest clause, you could discuss interest ad lib., its effect on the people and conditions arising out of it; but on this particular clause which refers to the extension of the charters for a term of ten years, if I happened to be in the chair—and I am glad I am not—I would find it difficult to rule against any discussion of the banking system of Canada.

Amongst other matters that I would like to call to the attention of this committee—and as an indication of my goodwill in this matter, I will lay aside any further quotations concerning the Almanac and the Merchants Bank—is that one of the most astonishing things to the people of this country is that at that time the Merchants Bank stock was worth $157. There is involved in this question, as I said, a moment ago, the question of mergers. The people of Canada are becoming more and more satisfied that the development of a money oligarchy in this country is not in the best interest of Canada. The development of that oligarchy has gone on under this Bank Act. No provision has yet been made in the Bank Act to prevent that. There are no restrictions on mergers; everything in that connection is left to the Minister of Finance. We find that in 1904 there were thirty-four banks in Canada with about 1,100 branches. In 1920, there were only eighteen banks, and to-day there are only seventeen with fully six or seven thousand branches. These banks were absorbed, swallowed up in the most extraordinary fashion. A few failed, but most of them were absorbed by larger banks. There seems to have been a contest between the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Bank of Toronto to see which would absorb or grab up the largest number. I am quoting from a book written by Mr. Baker, called "Money Monopoly vs. The Community Dollar" at page 84:

> It will be remembered that in an earlier chapter it was stated that in 1904 bank capital was equivalent to 11 per cent of total assets, while in 1920 the ratio had been decreased to 4 per cent. Therefore, not only did the banks fail to maintain their position in this respect, but they carried on a policy of expansion until they had four times as many branches with only a ratio of 4 per cent between capital and total assets.

This is but one of the evils that follow in the train of mergers. That question has not been properly or duly considered. Leaving aside this matter of the discussion of the investigation of the Merchants Bank, and that is one of the reasons why this amendment should carry, I should like to ask the following questions in the hope that some hon. member opposite will answer them. This would, perhaps, clear the minds of hon. members in this part of the chamber on this matter and not make them so convinced that the rights of the Canadian people are in jeopardy as their present position would indicate:

> Is it a fact that the directors of the Merchants Bank were compelled to sell out for protection of creditors or shareholders? Or were there other considerations which played a part in the impelling process?

These are questions I should like to have answered, possibly by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) or by the Minister of Finance when he speaks:

> Did the Bank of Montreal pay any more for the Merchants Bank than it was worth? If it did should the public not know how it covered up its loss? If it did not, and it is not likely that the Bank of Montreal did so, how is it that a corporation with capital intact and a surplus of 15 per cent of its capital. could be impelled to sell out to protect its shareholders and depositors? Since when have corporations become insolvent because they could pay their creditors, pay their stockholders, and distribute a dividend from surplus of 15 per cent? If the institution was strained for ready cash to meet its clearing obligations, why could it not have borrowed from the government just as other banks do when they are strained? Why did not the Bank of Montreal and other banks assist the Merchants Bank if its stock was worth 115?

In fact, it was worth more than that at one time, just prior to the merger:

> Is it possible that the associated banks did not like the business methods of the Merchants Bank, such as founding and advertising Christmas clubs?

There are many other questions, but I will leave these with the hon. members, and if they can answer them they can satisfy me more than I expect to be satisfied by the members of this committee.

Perhaps the greatest reason that can be put forward for the extension of these charges for one year only at this time is that we have in this country admittedly, admitted by the greatest bankers that those who are interested could get before the committee on banking, a gap in the credit structure of Canada, a gap for which no provision is made and for which they say no provision can be made under the banking system. Yet no one of those bankers came to us, nor did the Bankers' Association

come to us with any proposal designed to cover the gap. As we have no suggestion offered in this regard, to whom shall we go? Hon. members opposite have suggested a rural credit scheme. All rural credit schemes in Canada to-day are based in the final analysis on the banks, and yet we know that the banks are antagonistic to rural schemes. They have shown that only too clearly in Manitoba and Ontario. Hon. members opposite say: Be calm; be quiet; we will get a rural credit scheme for you some time, we do not know just when, but some time. I ask: What are you going to do? There is no proposal in this regard before the committee. There is no justification for the statements they are making. If they have a rural credit scheme, we would be delighted to consider and discuss it.

There are in this country three great papers, in particular the Financial Post, the Montreal Star, the Winnipeg Free Press, and indeed many others that have asked that these bank charters be extended for only one year at this time. You have heard hon. members around me speak of organizations that have asked for the same thing. Mention was made by the hon. member for Victoria, Alta. (Mr. Lucas), to the effect that Mr. Tom Moore had sent him a letter embodying or containing resolutions from various trades and labour councils of Victoria, Calgary, Edmonton, and various other places. The senior member for Halifax interrupted him, and suggested that Mr. Moore had been before the committee but that he had not brought that question up, that it had not been discussed and he had no suggestions to offer. I would submit to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that perhaps Mr. Moore had a few weeks in which to consider this question since he left the committee and had decided that it was in the best interests of the Canadian people, and in addition to that had secured these resolutions from the Trades and Labour Councils. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that when the senior member for Halifax says that no good and sufficient reasons have been brought before this House for the extension of the charter for one year, I would submit that when these bodies of highly organized, and I say, highly intelligent people — labour, the farmers, the governments of Alberta and of Manitoba —have seen fit to make this request, surely that alone should be a good and sufficient reason. The people have not had time to consider the evidence. They have not had time to digest the matter properly and to come to a decision. Many proposals have been brought forward. None of them has received due consideration. We hope they will soon. They will have to, in my opinion some time or other.

In closing, let me emulate the example of the member for George Etienne Cartier, who is an adept at facetiousness and telling humorous stories. The hon. gentlemen likened the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) to the cuttlefish. May I say that the hon. member himself (Mr. Jacobs) reminds me of the story of a darkey I once read about, who lived in the cornfield country of the South. In the midst of a thunderstorm this darkey was driving a team of mules home late at night. Between the flashes of lightning there was dense darkness, and he could see nothing, not even the road, he was terror-stricken, and the mules were getting more restless all the time. When the lightning flashed he would see the road for a moment or two, and it temporarily renewed his courage. After a time the poor old darkey could stand it no longer, and then he prayed as I do, "Oh, Lord, let there be less noise and more light".

Mr. COOTE: I regret that the government has seen fit to compel the House to sit to this late hour for the consideration of what I think is the most important subject that will come before this parliament this session. There is no subject of any greater importance to the people of this country than the revision of the Bank Act. The matter of currency and credit is one of prime importance to the people of this country. I feel that the inquiry by the committee on Banking and Commerce into the working of the Bank Act during the past ten years was very inadequate, but so far as the inquiry was carried on, it seemed to me that it was amply proved before the committee that the banking situation in this country was very far from satisfactory. If that is the case, I cannot see why the Finance Minister is so determined that the charters must be renewed for ten years. I believe that some of our own bankers are quite concerned in regard to the situation which exists in Canada to-day; yet the Finance Minister says we must put this act through and he will brook no delay. He says: "You must do nothing which will interefere with the confidence of the public", but he has done nothing to find out whether the public confidence has been misplaced. I wonder whether he has heard any rumours to the effect that one of our banks, possibly more than one, is not in very good shape to-day. I wonder whether he is expecting that before another year passes he will have applications for the approval of one or more mergers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Two hon. gentlemen from the Progressive party told us that the whole thing is going to the bad inside of ten years.

Mr. COOTE: If one or two go each year, they might all be gone before long. I do not want to make any prediction, but those are possibly not idle rumours that we hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It does not do much good to talk about them.

Mr. COOTE: No, it does not. I wonder what would do some good about it. It might be just as well if we knew more about it, but I may say very frankly that it did not seem to me that it was the wish of that committee that we should know anything we could be prevented from finding out. I hope that is not unfair, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to be unfair. I simply said it appeared to me that way. In this country we have seen our chartered banks decrease from 34 in 1901 to 17 in 1923. In 1911, the paid-up capital of our banks was $96,000,000. In 1923, it had increased to $135,000,000. I am giving round figures. That is a very small increase, a trifle over 25 per cent, but in the same time our deposits in the Canadian banks had increased from $926,000,000 to $1,995,000,000. That is considerably more than double. In the same time our total trade in Canada has increased from $741,000,000 to $2,450,000,000, an increase of over 300 per cent. In the same time the bank loans have increased from $986,000,000 in 1911, to $1,851,000,000 to-day. That is practically double. When we consider the small amount of paid-up capital which our Canadian banks have, the amount of business they are transacting, and the amount of deposits of the public they are handling, to use a slang expression, I think we could say they are doing business on a shoestring. This large expansion in Canadian trade which has taken place in the last ten or thirteen years has made necessary a large increase in the amount of money for circulation; and to meet this demand for an increase in circulation, our banks, instead of increasing their paid-up capital, as I think they should have, had to resort to other expedients to meet the demand for the circulation. First, they got the privilege of an increase of 15 per cent—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but it has been held —and there is no question about it—that general argument on a bill cannot be allowed on a particular clause. I fear he is getting along that line, and I am drawing his attention to it.

Mr. COOTE: I will discontinue that line of argument. Possibly, we have had enough of it, and I may be ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to it. I do not say he has reached that point yet.

Mr. COOTE: I want to lead up to this fact, Mr. Chairman; that the bank business of Canada is now in the hands of the directors of seventeen banks, and, through the Bankers' Association, the directors of three or four of the different banks are able to dictate the financial policy of this country.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is quite relevant to bring that to the attention of the committee as one reason why it would be quite proper to accept the amendment offered by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) and see if we cannot within the next year amend the Bank Act to free the country from the control of these few men. If, Mr. Chairman, I might be allowed to use the expression of Sir John Aird before the committee on Banking and Commerce in referring to certain railway corporations, I would say we are now in the hands of a banking octopus, and if we have any more mergers the hold of this octopus upon the general public will be that much stronger.

The present state of affairs is particularly unfortunate in that the directors of some of our larger banks are controlling the board of governors of our leading universities. Quite recently I was told by a professor that he dared not criticize the Bank Act as some members of the board of governors of his university were bank directors and he might lose his job. These directors not only control our universities but also our industries, and, indeed, it might even be said that they control our government. Our peculiar banking system has made this possible, as the whole tendency is toward centralization. The savings of the people are taken from the smaller towns and rural communities to build up a few of the large cities. The funds of the banks are used to finance schemes under the control of the directors, and very often I imagine at a lower rate of interest than can be secured by those engaged in these industries in the smaller towns and cities, making it very hard for them to compete with the larger organizations. Right in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I might be allowed to quote two or three paragraphs from an address by Mr. Andrew Jay Fame, Chairman of the Board of Waukesha National Bank, Wisconsin, at a Bankers' Association meeting in the

United States in reference to our banking system. He says:

> In Canada some seventeen central banks (reduced from more than thirty some years ago) now skim the cream from over 4,000 branches, leaving only the skim milk for the rural and suburban populations. Branches have no local stockholders, no presidents, or cashiers. They practically pay no taxes and have figureheads for managers, subject to alien officers' orders. The most serious objection is practically no profits are distributed locally where they are made, thus impoverishing the nation at large for the sole benefit of monopolizers in the great centres.
>
> Statistics clearly show that failures of banks and losses to depositors in Canada, compared with our National Banking System, exceed ours several times over. These facts are confirmed by at least one ex-manager of a big central bank in Canada and by other authorities I am not at liberty to quote. Her banking power is less than little Massachusetts alone. She is asleep compared to our progress.

He then quotes from an article in the Toronto Star of some years ago on the Canadian branch banking system.

The CHAIRMAN: I must really stop the hon. member. I do not see how this could be relevant to the question of whether the bank charters should be renewed for one year or ten years. The quotation deals with the general principle of banking.

Mr. COOTE: I was using this argument, Mr. Chairman, because I thought the committee should investigate to see whether our Bank Act might not be improved in respect to this particular system.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member knows that this committee has very limited powers of investigation. The bill was referred to this committee for the purpose of discussing these sections and reporting or not reporting it. This committee has not the powers of a standing committee.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, if I might be allowed to quote one sentence from this editorial I will be satisfied. It says:

> Monster banking monopoly a leech at Canada's throat killing local industry, depopulating rural districts. Centralization of almost entire financial power in the hands of a few capitalists has resulted from our much vaunted banking system. Almost total extermination of local banks.
>
> Planting of a "branch" to suck our local earnings, etc.

I should like to read a little more of this editorial, Mr. Chairman, but it will keep. The small percentage of the paid up capital of our banks compared to the deposits results, I think, in our banks becoming panic-stricken in times of financial stringency, and they close down on their customers when they think deflation is imminent. There is no doubt that in the past this has caused great loss to their borrowers and very often to the banks themselves, I think, because the assets under forced liquidation were not sufficient to pay the debtors' liabilities. Our whole credit structure is built up on the confidence which the public have in the system—

The CHAIRMAN: Surely, the hon. member is dealing with the general principle of banking and the credit system. I do not see how it is possible by any stretch of the imagination to connect this with any reason why bank charters should not be granted for ten years but for one year only. It is my duty to rule the hon. gentleman out of order.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I was just about to bring to the attention of the committee what I think is one of the main reasons for this postponement, namely, that the committee on Banking and Commerce absolutely refused to call a witness who was acquainted with the actual working of the Federal Reserve Banks in the United States. I wished to argue that the special committee should have called the witness.

The CHAIRMAN: Any failure of a special committee, or a ruling of its chairman, is not reviewable by this committee, and is not an argument presentable in this committee on this particular section.

Mr. COOTE: I do not know what argument would be relevant if that is not.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant, and I have so ruled.

Mr. COOTE: I do not know what better reason could be advanced, Mr. Chairman, and if that is your ruling I have very little more to say. I wished, Sir, to put before this committee the action of the special committee on Banking and Commerce with regard to one or two other matters.

The CHAIRMAN: This committee has no power to deal with the ruling of a special committee. If the chairman of that committee submitted the question, and it was decided in the affirmative or the negative, it cannot be reviewed by this committee.

Mr. COOTE: Then I will have very little more to say, because that was my chief reason for asking for support to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Red Deer. It does seem to me that the bill as brought down is very inadequate to deal with the situation which exists in Canada to-day. The Minister of Finance, if he had been well acquainted with the situation in this country, should have done something more to meet the situation than he has done in the legislation now proposed. I have some other in-

formation here that I would have liked to put before the committee, particularly in regard to the Commonwealth Bank,—how it would be applicable to this country; how it would improve, I think, the banking system of this country if it were introduced here, and the benefit it might be to this government and the country at large. But owing to the narrow limits within which we are compelled to keep by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time care to say anything further except that I trust this amendment will be given honest consideration by the members of the committee.

Mr. GOOD: I would like again to protest against the exclusion of evidence of this sort. It does seem to me that the presentation by the hon. member for Macleod of certain matters dealing with the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, as bearing upon the question of postponements, would be entirely relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that it is not relevant, and I cannot in any way see that it is relevant. The question is on the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Speakman) negatived; Yeas, 27; Nays, 65.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Particulars of Act of Incorporation.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask the government if it is their intention to press on with the Bank Act all night?

Mr. FIELDING: No. At a very early stage, as soon as we meet a clause to which an amendment is proposed, we will let it stand over and have the committee rise We might run through these uncontested clauses.

Section agreed to.

On section 13—First meeting of subscribers.

Mr. COOTE: I intended to move an amendment to section 20 asking for permission to establish smaller banks, and it would necessitate—

Mr. FIELDING: We may go on until that clause is reached; then I shall be glad to move that the committee rise.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I submit that the hon. member for Macleod has not been fully heard. I think he was going on to explain when interrupted that this section if passed now would prevent the formation of smaller banks under section 20.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. gentleman desires to move an amendment to it, I will move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Tuesday).

Tuesday, June 19, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS

Sixth report of the Special Committee appointed to inquire into Agricultural Conditions; also seventh report of the same, with evidence and other documents.—Mr. McMaster.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted again to present the petition of W. J. Bartlett and a number of other residents of British Columbia in regard to the naturalization of Japanese and also in regard to the further immigration of Japanese into this country? You will remember there were some irregularities on the former occasion; I think the petition is now in order.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 224 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Samuel McDonnell.—Mr. Jacobs.

SOLDIERS' HOSPITALS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Have the government decided to close Euclid Hall, Toronto, and Brant House, Burlington, soldiers' hospitals? If so, who recommended it and why, and when will the hospitals be closed? I would ask the government whether arrangements could not be made to have Euclid Hall and Brant House continued as convalescent homes. It is no economy to close them.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): The question of closing Brant House is under consideration. It had been the intention of the department to close the hospital very shortly, but in view of some representations made by delegations who waited upon some of my colleagues and myself a few days ago, we have decided to defer definite action until I can personally visit the place.

Mr. CHURCH: I think it should be kept open until September at least, when the warm weather is over. Many of the patients in that institution are incurable cases.

Mr. BELAND: The matter does deserve serious and sympathetic consideration.

RULING OF MR. SPEAKER

NON-DEBATABLE MOTION—EFFECT OF PROCEDURE UPON THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to take occasion to call attention to a ruling made by you yesterday, a ruling to which I did not take exception at the time, as I could clearly see it followed a ruling similar in every respect made by Hon. Mr. Rhodes, the previous Speaker of this House. I have given some attention to the subject, because I think if the ruling is to stand it is very serious, and because I believe the ruling not to be right. It was given upon the calling of an order of the day, numbered, I think, 45. The order merely read, "House in Committee of the Whole" on a certain bill, namely, the bill to amend the Bank Act. The ruling was—

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, there is nothing before the Chair at the present moment. The right hon. member, I am sure, is not appealing from yesterday's decision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: He desires to call the attention of the House to the ruling and its consequences.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent that might be allowed.

Mr. FIELDING: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we can appeal from your ruling if we do not like it, but I do not think we have a right to call it in question the day following.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not asking for an appeal. My reason for bringing the matter up on the Orders of the Day is that I think it is as appropriate as any other matter on the Orders of the Day; it is a matter that concerns the privileges of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the right hon. gentleman make it a question of privilege, a matter affecting the privileges of the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The privileges of the House.

[Mr. Beland.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Then, I think he is in order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not making it in any spirit of complaint against the ruling, because I realize it is fully in accord with the precedent quoted by Your Honour in giving the ruling. As I stated, it was upon the calling of an order which merely read, "House in Committee of the Whole" on a certain bill. It was held there could not be debate upon a motion which was called from the Chair as appertaining to that order, the motion being that the Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on that bill.

Mr. VIEN: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) were appealing from your decision of yesterday, he would be out of order, as he himself admits. Otherwise it would be a question of changing the rules of the House. Either Your Honour's decision was right or it was not. If your decision was right, then the right hon. gentleman can only move to change the rules of the House; if it was wrong, then he had the right of appeal from it yesterday. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to amend the rules of the House he may proceed in the ordinary course, but I do not believe he is entitled to take that matter up on the Orders of the Day. Moreover, there is in the point raised no question of infringement of the privileges of the House. It is only when there has been such an infringement that the privileges of the House may be brought up in this way; otherwise, I do not believe the question can be raised at this stage. Therefore I respectfully submit that my right hon. friend is not in order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not propose to argue the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was as convenient to bring the matter to the attention of yourself and of the House now as at any other time. If hon. members feel they do not want to have the discussion now, I will wait until a time when the decision may come again, and then I can discuss it. I do not know what the House is going to gain by the delay. I had hoped that by having the matter presented now we might avoid a precedent which I think would be serious later.

Mr. FIELDING: Will there not be a more serious precedent if my right hon. friend claims the right to discuss a matter which was decided by the Speaker on a previous day? I think that would be a very awkward precedent to establish.

Mr. SHAW: In order to settle the controversy, may I suggest that the House will be going into Committee of the Whole in a few moments, and the same question may then be raised?

Mr. SPEAKER: I was going to suggest that the right hon. gentleman make his objections or representations when a similar motion comes before the House in the course of the regular proceedings to-day. I quite agree that the right hon. gentleman is not appealing to-day from the decision that was rendered yesterday. I gather from his remarks that he more particularly refers to another ruling which was given the other day on a notice of motion that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole. There was on that occasion a little discussion about the right to debate the question before the Speaker left the Chair, and I think that is the phase of the question which the right hon. gentleman wishes to make clear to-day. He will, however, have an opportunity to raise the question again when a similar motion comes regularly before the House.

HINDU FRANCHISE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): There is a resolution standing in my name on the order paper respecting Hindu franchise, and I am unable to proceed with it owing to the fact that private members' day has been taken away. That being so, I should like to know if the government would be prepared to fix a day upon which this question might be discussed. I understand that this matter is likely to come before the Imperial Conference in London next October, and inasmuch as the Prime Minister, who I understand is going to be present at the conference, might want to have his hand strengthened by a decision from this House on the question, I was wondering if we could not have a day or part of a day set aside for the discussion of this important question.

Mr. NEILL: Christmas Day.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would think that the most appropriate time to discuss this matter would be when the Franchise Act itself is up for consideration. Of course, it is not possible that this measure will be discussed this session, but if my hon. friend wishes to touch upon any aspect of the coming Imperial Conference, this among others he will be free to do so when we have that item under consideration.

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING COMBINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. A. HOEY (Springfield): I should like to embrace this opportunity to ask the government if it is their intention in the immediate future to take action, criminal or otherwise, against the men who together constituted the Great Lakes shipping combine. It is some weeks since the report of the commission was tabled. The people of Canada are deeply interested in this question. I do not know that proceedings could be taken under the Anti-Combines Act that we passed this session, but I know that any action taken would be in complete accord with the spirit of that legislation which we have passed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government is presenting to the House legislation which it is hoped will deal with the matters that are referred to by my hon. friend. Just as to whether any prosecutions should be instituted for actions that are past will depend, I think, pretty much upon the law as it stands at the moment.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on Bill No. 83 respecting banks and banking, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I asked last night that this clause might be allowed to stand over as it was my intention to submit an amendment. I have decided, however, not to bring that amendment forward as I am of the opinion that it would not receive the support of the committee. I would like to say a few words in regard to this section.

I think it is a mistake for this committee to say that people should not be allowed to start a bank in this country unless and until the new organization has a subscribed capital of $500,000. I would urge upon the minister the desirability of making it somewhat easier for any group of individuals in this country to get together and start a bank if they so desire. At the present time the banking business in this country is in the hands of a very small group of individuals, and I do not see that there is any possibility of relief from the present situation unless the act is amended to allow banks to start with a smaller capitalization. The reason I am not moving an amendment is that I do not know just what figure to suggest that might meet with the approval of this committee, but I do want to point out that by this legislation we are making it impossible for the people in

any town or village to start a bank even if they desire to do so and have money sufficient for the purpose. I do not think it is right for this parliament to say that these people should not be allowed to start a bank. Surely, that is carrying the prohibition too far. I would respectfully urge upon the Minister of Finance to take this matter into his most serious consideration and see whether it would not be wise to allow the banks to be started with a smaller subscribed capital than is here provided. The banking system in the United States has been built up through the formation of very small banks in the main. There are many banks in the United States which started with a capital of $25,000 and which have now a paid up capital of $1,000,000 or more, and it does seem to me that it would be possible for us to build up some banks in Canada under that same system, particularly as we now have upon the statute books the War Finance Act which allows banks to re-discount their securities with the Finance Department. Without discussing the matter at any greater length I would earnestly urge this upon the Minister of Finance for his consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: The question referred to by my hon. friend is undoubtedly one of much interest and importance. It has been well considered by the department, and I think I may say it was pretty carefully considered by the committee. There is certainly something to be said in favour of the hon. member's suggestion. On the other hand, there are several reasons which I think can be properly urged against it. To begin with, in these days of big things a small enterprise in any line of business will have trouble in competing with the larger concern. A small bank will have a great difficulty in competing with a larger institution. There are certain expenses incidental to management which have to apply to a small bank and also to a large one, and it is only because these expenses can be distributed over a large area in the case of the larger institution that the cost of the organization and management may be deemed reasonable. That in itself is the reason why, I think, a small bank would have, from the very beginning, great difficulty in holding its own.

Then there is another consideration. The argument for a small bank is that it appeals to the local feeling, appeals to the local pride. There is certainly force in that. But that which is an argument at one moment in its favour is really a good argument against it. The tendency of the small bank, appealing to local feeling, appealing to local pride, is to become so identified with local affairs that it, so to speak, puts all its eggs into one basket, and when trouble occurs the small bank, dependent upon local business, has an exceedingly difficult task to exist. I think, take it all in all, that any bank which is organized in Canada at a smaller capital than that which is required under the existing law would have a poor chance of success. I doubt whether any honourable member who thinks it out would do well to advise anybody to put money into a small bank in Canada with the expectation that it could compete successfully against the larger institutions.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister has said that the danger in connection with the small local banks is that they are apt to become localized in their activities and, having put all their eggs in one basket, to use the illustration he mentioned, would have greater difficulty in existing when trouble came. Does he not think that a rediscounting system in connection with the local bank would overcome the danger which he anticipates?

Mr. FIELDING: That raises another question. I think the activities of the small bank would be localized. Even though it might utilize a system of rediscounting in the way suggested to my hon. friend it would still be a local institution. The danger is that it would become so local and so interested in a few local enterprises that, I think the experience has shown in Canada—I do not want to discuss the American system—the small bank would be a menace to the financial situation, and would not tend to promote that stability in financial affairs which, I am sure, hon. gentlemen opposite are as anxious to maintain as I am.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to question the argument of the Minister of Finance when he refers to the alleged difficulty the small banks might have in competing wtih the larger banks. As a matter of fact in the United States they have developed a vast number of smaller banks. These banks, it is true, have failed in a number of cases, but I think the statistics given in the committee on Banking and Commerce showed that the proportion of failures was considerably less than in Canada. Now, these are facts, and while everyone would admit the existence of certain difficulties the small banks would have to face, those who look at the matter fairly must also admit that there are certain very distinct advantages, not only from the standpoint of utility to the neighbourhood, to the community, but from the standpoint of

actual efficiency and operation—for example the low overhead expenses. We ought, I think, as a matter of principle, to allow free competition between the large branch bank systems such as we have in Canada and the local bank system. Nobody knows which is the best? How can you tell if you do not try? If the legislation practically prohibits the formation of any small banks the argument surely is not valid that the small bank cannot compete against its larger competitor and is of no use. I submit that in the United States, a country very like our own, the small bank has proven entirely satisfactory, particularly since it has been linked up with the federal reserve system of that country. I feel that this is a matter which must receive consideration sooner or later, and we might as well face the situation now. The experience in Canada has been referred to by the Minister of Finance. I presume he refers to a number of failures of small banks years ago; but we have had a number of failures of larger banks, and I do not know that any evidence has been submitted in the standing committee or in the Committee of the Whole which would show that the proportion of failures in small banks has been any greater in volume than the proportion in our larger banks. I quite agree with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) that there is not much prospect of getting anything like this system in operation, particularly as it was turned down in the Banking and Commerce committee. However, I would like to place myself on record as stating that in my opinion we ought to allow a fair field and no favours and not prohibit the smaller bank, which has been very useful elsewhere, from getting a start in Canada. I think it may be particularly useful and particularly stable when we link it up with the federal reserve system, or with the Treasury Board under our Finance Act.

Mr. LOGAN: I believe that the capitalization of the banks at the present time is entirely too large. The Minister of Finance has referred to the disadvantage of localizing banks. In the Maritime provinces we are suffering from the disadvantages of centralization. Twenty years ago, Mr. Chairman, we had, if I remember rightly, fourteen banks with their head offices in those provinces. We had fourteen boards of directors, comprising the leading and best business minds of the Maritime provinces, sitting around the boards of those respective banks and considering the needs and necessities of the Maritime provinces to a large extent. They knew our difficulties, they sympathized with our ambitions, and we were able at that time to secure banking accommodation in a rather liberal way. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have not a single bank with bank directors sitting round the board in the Maritime provinces; and it has been said by someone, and I guess it is probably true, that there is no individual, and no board of directors in these provinces having the real right to-day to advance even $20,000 on a credit without the matter being referred to the head office in Montreal or Toronto. Now, I am not attacking the bank directors in Montreal and Toronto, nor am I attacking the banking system as it exists to-day. I think, taking it all in all, that it was, in its inception at any rate, a very great banking system. But there may be, and I think there is necessity to-day for some amendments. Nevertheless, the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the man in the Maritime provinces in order to get credit must first go to a local bank manager. This manager may not understand very many of our difficulties, but the system is to report to the head office, and the board of directors in the head office will issue or deny that credit, depending largely upon the recommendation of the local manager. The local manager may so report as to cause the application to be received with considerable favour. He may be a local banker in whom the head office has very great confidence, and his recommendation may receive more consideration than that of some other bank manager.

Mr. VIEN: Has not the Bank of Nova Scotia its head office in Halifax?

Mr. FIELDING: Nominally.

Mr. LOGAN: Nominally it has its head office in the city of Halifax where you would think the head office of the Bank of Nova Scotia should be; but practically the head office of that bank is one thousand miles away from the province from which it derives its name.

Mr. VIEN: How does my hon. friend explain the disappearance of these small banks and the location of the headquarters elsewhere?

Mr. FIELDING: It is not a small bank, it is a large bank.

Mr. VIEN: It is a large bank, yes. Moreover, how would my hon. friend prevent the same thing occurring to the small banks of which he advocates the creation?

Mr. LOGAN: I presume the reason for the change of head office to Montreal and Toronto lies in the tendency in Canada towards centralization along all lines. I am not asking that

legislation be passed here to compel the formation of banks in the Maritime provinces; but what I do say is that we should not shut the door against the formation of new banks, even though we may lose later on. I know of individual cases of clients of mine who have suffered very serious injury through a lack of knowledge on the part of the local bank manager, on one hand, and, on the other, a lack of knowledge on the part of the directors sitting a thousand miles away considering the case. It is natural that men in Nova Scotia or in the Maritime provinces should know more about that part of the country, the men, the character of borrowers, than any body of men can possibly know sitting a thousand miles away. I was not a member of the committee on Banking and Commerce; in fact, I was not here during the greater part of the session. But I have taken the trouble to read the minutes of the proceedings of that committee, and I find that a motion was made there to reduce the amount to $50,000. I would vote against that, because I think the amount is too small. On the other hand, however, I certainly think that $500,000 is too large a sum to fix as the minimum in this day; we might very well reduce it to $150,000 or $250,000 in order that it might be easier for men in the outlying parts of the Dominion to form banks to deal with local affairs. People ask, what is the matter with the Maritime provinces, and why is it that we are losing our population? Well, there are several reasons, one being of course the high cost of transportation. But among the several reasons that may be offered for this condition, one of the most outstanding is the fact that we have lost our money control in the Maritime provinces, so that it is exceedingly difficult to secure for local enterprises sufficient capital to carry on when we have to appeal to a board a thousand miles away who very often know us not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If the question of small local banks were possible and practical I would very heartily endorse it; I fancy that nobody, in principle, is opposed to smaller local banks operating within a limited area. Indeed, the present Canadian act is not against small banks because it expressly provides that a bank with a capitalization of $500,000 may start business. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) deprecates the fact that in the Maritime provinces we have no small banks. I might say to him, however, that in the city of Halifax as well as in St. John, there would not be the slightest difficulty whatever in securing $500,000 of capital with which to start a bank and operate it locally if the people thought that it could exist and successfully continue in business.

[Mr. Logan.]

Mr. LOGAN: You have not tried it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It has been tried in Nova Scotia, but without success. Now, hon. members refer to the experience of the banking system of the United States. In banking, as in a great many other enterprises, if a system is once instituted it is difficult to abandon it and immediately inaugurate a new one. The branch bank system of Canada is as old as confederation. I am not saying whether it is best or not, but I do say that it has fairly well provided for the necessities of the country in the past; in fact, I do not know what other kind of banking system could have prevailed in Canada. When one reflects that we have in this country a population of eight or nine millions occupying vast stretches of territory, one is forced to ask where the capital would have come from to establish in the cities and the towns and villages of Canada the banking offices that exist to-day, were it not for the branch bank system. I do not think it would have been possible; and whatever the defects of the system may be—and I presume it has defects—I say, nevertheless, that it has served Canada well.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has referred to the experience of small banks in the country. I remember in my own time, in the province of Nova Scotia, there were two local banks, which, I think, had not a single agency. Within the last twenty years they have gone out of business. And I might refer to other banks much more substantial, such for example as the Northern Crown, of Winnipeg. That bank merged with the Royal Bank either in 1918 or 1919. It was in a fairly liquid position, yet they found they could not safely loan their resources and protect their depositors and shareholders. They therefore had to go out of business. Nothing was said about the matter at the time; that particular merger was not criticized. But in banks, as in every other business institution, there is likely to come a time when the shareholders decide that they must liquidate or sell. And that very substantial bank, the Northern Crown, was obliged to do that. Or take the case of the Bank of Ottawa—a very strong institution, well entrenched in the Ottawa valley and with a splendid body of directors. A few years ago that bank found its position was in danger; at least, it could not sustain its position unless it spread out through the various provinces of Canada, which it had neglected to do in previous years. It was a bank in which a few persons were the principal shareholders, who thought they could not get additional capital by appealing to the public. And so

they declined to put further capital into the enterprise and in the end decided that it was better to merge with the Bank of Nova Scotia. The same thing happened in the case of the Bank of British North America, which was largely a Canadian bank without the shareholders' double liability. They had not established agencies throughout Canada in many places and they found the competition of the stronger banks, which had established themselves freely in all the provinces, so keen that they were obliged to sell.

There is one thing that may be said of the branch bank system which perhaps may be regarded as somewhat in the way of criticism: It makes it difficult for the small local bank to succeed. As the Minister of Finance has pointed out, however, we know very well that the small bank with local directors unfortunately succumbs to local influences, and too soon its resources are held by a few borrowers in the locality. And that is the difficulty. Under good management this might be avoided; but unfortunately our experience in the past only confirms this opinion.

Now, in these days, is $500,000 too much capital to require of a bank starting in business? It is no more than the equivalent of $200,000 or $250,000 ten years ago. A bank with just that volume of assets could not engage in a very heavy banking business even in a small locality. There might be considerable to say for the reduction of this minimum of $500,000; but the question arises, at what sum will you fix the minimum? Furthermore, is it wise to take the responsibility in view of the history of banking in Canada, and our experience in the past?

Again, there is the difficulty of obtaining good bank managers in Canada to-day. The present banks complain—they complained before the committee on Banking and Commerce—of this very matter. Further, I would point out that the small local bank will not receive deposits against the stronger banks doing business throughout Canada, and that is another consideration.

Mr. MILLAR: Would the hon. member admit that the experience of the Weyburn Securities Bank is an exception?—it has succeeded against the larger banks.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am very glad to say that it is an exception. It is a small bank with seventeen branches.

Mr. STEVENS: It is operating under this act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, it had the minimum capital of $500,000.

Mr. MILLAR: It is a small bank.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, and I am glad to see that it is developing and becoming stronger. I only wish there were a great number of such institutions in the West. But there is this to be remembered in connection with the Weyburn Securities, it is a bank the shares of which are held by just two or three people, and I am informed that frequently they have had to come to the assistance of the bank. Then, the general manager has had an experience which peculiarly fits him for operating in the particular territory in which that bank conducts its business. That bank has great difficulty in earning dividends, and it is very important for a bank to earn dividends. Some hon. gentlemen across the way last night deplored the fact that in these days banks were paying dividends. As soon as a bank ceases to pay dividends, it ceases to do a banking business. You cannot compare a bank with an ordinary commercial business. Ordinary commercial corporations may suspend indefinitely the payment of dividends; but as soon as a bank fails to earn its dividends, its shareholders require the liquidation of the company in order to avoid the double liability; depositors will leave them, and for these and other reasons it is very important that banks earn dividends. I am glad, however, to express the hope that the Weyburn Securities Bank will continue to do business in the West. It would be very desirable if it could be brought about that other banks of that size could be established in that area.

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) suggested that possibly with a discount system in Canada, local banks might have an easier course to travel. There may be something in that, and probably the day will come when we shall have a rediscount bank in Canada. Then the establishment of local banks will perhaps, become a practical question. But there will always be this difficulty, that the small local bank will not be likely to have the kind of security which will be acceptable to rediscount banks; the better classes of securities will go to the stronger banks. I am not saying that in an absolute or dogmatic fashion. I might be wrong in that respect; but I think when we have functioning in this country an organized rediscount banking system, it is just possible that local banks may successfully venture into the local banking business. The whole question is whether, in these days particularly when capital is timid, is it worth while to authorize the inauguration of banking business by banking companies with a smaller capital than $500,000. Personally, I do not believe that within the next five or ten years you could get

capital to engage in a purely local banking business anyway, except, perhaps, under exceptional circumstances such as prevailed when the gentlemen came over from the United States and started the Weyburn Securities.

Mr. IRVINE: There is a good deal of force in the argument which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has just put forward, as well as in that of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I think the committee will realize and agree that in the past there has been a decided tendency towards mergers. I do not think any legislation that we can make will successfully combat that, because it seems to me a natural response to conditions generally. I agree also
4 p.m. that the present branch bank system has been peculiarly fitted to the conditions of a new country, and it is doing a very great service. I see also the force of the argument of the Minister of Finance that a small bank would, perhaps, have a great deal more difficulty in maintaining itself against the competition of larger institutions. But, at the same time, I do not think it is entirely wise for us to shut out small banks from making the attempt. In view of all these things, it is not likely that many will make the attempt —I think that is true. And so I would like to ask the Minister of Finance this question. In his opinion, what possible harm could come by reducing the amount required to start a bank, say, to $250,000? If no serious harm could be foreseen, would the minister entertain the idea of reducing the initial amount of capital stock?

Mr. FIELDING: I would not think it was wise to induce people to put their money into a small bank. I think any money that is put into a small bank is not wisely invested, for the chances are that it will not be a successful institution. I think the amount of $500,000 is not an excessive sum. May I say with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) that I deplore, as he does, the fact that so many of our Nova Scotia banks have moved their headquarters to Montreal or Toronto? But I do not see how that can be prevented. I do not see anything in the Bank Act which created that situation, and I do not know of any provision in the Bank Act which could prevent it. It is one of the results of what I might call evolution under confederation. Many institutions which were prosperous in the Maritime provinces in the days before confederation are complaining to-day. I do not want to discuss the question of confederation; I simply state a fact. I remember when there were twenty wholesale houses in Halifax all doing a prosperous business; to-day there is hardly one of them left. They have all been driven out by Montreal. As regards the banks which we had in Nova Scotia, the shareholders who built up the banks in that province found it convenient to sell their stock to other people. I have never found any complaint coming from the Maritime provinces as to this particular part of the act. There have been suggestions from other parts of the country that they would establish banks if they had the opportunity; but I never had any complaint from the lower provinces. And if they had an opportunity, I do not think any banks would be established in the lower provinces with a capital of less than $500,000, because their knowledge and experience of banking would satisfy them that the smaller institution could not have a fair chance in the competition for business.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to say just one word in reply to a point raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), that is about the Northern Crown Bank being amalgamated with another bank. I do not remember the particulars, but I understand this was a profitable venture for the people who founded that bank and afterwards found it wise to amalgamate. I suppose the same thing would apply to the Bank of Ottawa, and if I mistake not, the same thing would apply to the Bank of British North America.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think it was a profitable sale for the Northern Crown because they had lost a great deal of their capital, and they had to furnish additional capital. The amalgamation was made after they found they could not succeed. It seems to me the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) had something to do with that bank, and he might inform us upon that point.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not recollect the particulars altogether; but in a general way the shareholders of the Northern Crown, when they transferred their stock, as they did under the amalgamation agreement, got out just about what they put in. I think some of them may have lost a little in the way of premiums which they paid on their stock, but they certainly got out as much as they put in, apart from any question of premiums.

Mr. COOTE: Just a word, Mr. Chairman, in regard to how this capitalization should be fixed. A lot of communities in Canada might be able to start a bank to take care of their local needs. Possibly none would

want to do so, but I do not think we should by this act forbid any community from embarking on such an undertaking. It seems to me less money has been lost in bank stocks in Canada in proportion to the total investment than in any other line. Possibly one of these small banks would fail once in a while, but I do not think such a failure would entail nearly as much hardship as the failure of one of our large banks. I do not think it is right for this committee to arbitrarily fix an amount of half a million dollars as the capital which must be subscribed. If any set of people want to invest their money in a bank with a smaller capitalization, I do not see why we should take it upon ourselves to prevent their doing so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I cannot recall the particular section, but is it not a fact that a bank can start business with a paid up capital of $250,000?

Mr. FIELDING: That is section 13.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, but if I remember rightly the subscribed capital must be half a million dollars.

Mr. FIELDING: There must be subscribers for half a million dollars, and they are liable to be called upon, but the bank can start in business on $250,000. Surely that is low enough. It is hardly fair to speak of half a million dollars being necessary.

Mr. COOTE: I trust the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) does not forget that there is a double liability clause attached to the stock.

Mr. FIELDING: That would be so in a small bank too.

Mr. COOTE: Certainly, and if a smaller amount were fixed it would be that much easier to start the bank. I think the minister is a little too determined to prevent people starting a bank if they want to. That is the point in my mind. I think he is taking a wrong view. He might think that even a quarter of a million dollars is not a very large amount, but, as I said before, it might be really more than was necessary for a bank to function in some particular locality.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): In regard to small banks, down in our province there is such competition for business among the chartered banks that as soon as it is thought the conditions warrant a branch is established in any village. I could cite cases where branches were established by the larger institutions for the benefit of the locality and the business offered was not sufficient to meet expenses, but the banks were willing to lose money in order to cater to the needs of the people. Where the banks are willing to meet every reasonable demand of the borrower, and also to take care of the deposits entrusted to them, I cannot see that any great advantage would be gained by the establishment of small, local banks, as there would be a greater risk to the depositors and the borrower would not get any cheaper money.

Mr. SPENCER: Criticism has been made in regard to the smaller banks because the managers and directors often get to know their clientele too well. I am afraid that this criticism does not apply to the present system of branch banks. I know of one locality where there have been six managers of the branch bank in the last ten years. It will be readily understood that under these circumstances, and with the directors residing about three thousand miles away, the bank has very little in common indeed with the localities where their branches are established. A few weeks ago we passed a Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Act. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we prevent competition by forbidding the establishment of smaller banks we are encouraging such combinations among the banking fraternity. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) referred to a sudden changing of the system. But the change would be very gradual indeed and business would not be upset in the slightest degree. It is simply a case of asking for a fair field and no favour. The criticism has often been made that more branch banks are not established because there are not sufficient local deposits to warrant their establishment. I should like to see that criticism confirmed by figures showing what deposits are placed in the banks in the Maritime provinces, the prairie provinces and British Columbia. We do not seem to have those figures given to us very readily. I think probably they would disclose that vast deposits are placed in the banks in those parts of Canada.

There is one other argument, and I think it takes some answering. We have two countries side by side, the United States with an independent banking system, Canada with a branch bank system. Both countries have many things in common, including vast stretches of thinly populated country. One, however, has developed very fast indeed, the other has practically stood still. And, in the words of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), the banking system in the United

States has had less failure on a percentage basis than the much-vaunted system of branch banks in Canada.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—Who shall be directors.

Mr. GOOD: I beg to move that this section be amended by inserting after the word "election" in the second line the words, "but not less than a majority of the votes cast."

Mr. FIELDING: Would the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. GOOD: This House some months ago endorsed the proposition that members of the House be elected by a majority vote, and I think it is customary for the directors of any concern also to be elected by a majority vote. I simply ask by the amendment that what is generally recognized as good practice should be incorporated in this clause. I do not know whether or not there is any particular need for it, but the clause as it is leaves it quite open for the directors to be elected by minority votes. I do not think any possible harm can come from requiring the shareholders of a bank to see to it that they elect their directors by a majority.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): A fair and equitable principle is involved in the proposal of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), and I think it should meet with the approval of the committee and of the minister. No harm can be done by it; much good might result from it.

Mr. FIELDING: I have never heard of any trouble arising under this clause, and I do not think we need look round for any.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD: I think we ought to have a better reason than that.

Amendment (Mr. Good) negatived; Yeas, 23; Nays, 38.

Section agreed to.

On section 30—Appointment of officers, etc.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to move that section 30 be amended by adding thereto, as subsection 4, the following:

4. Such officers, clerks and servants shall have and be deemed to have the right of association for all lawful purposes.

Under the Treaty of Versailles all employed persons are guaranteed the right to organize. Canada and this government are definitely committed to the principle of that clause of the treaty. The phraseology here is, I may say, taken direct from the treaty. In connection with a great many other institutions and organizations the right of employees to organize is specially recognized, and it seems to me it should be in this connection. We are here providing for various things—that the directors may appoint these officers and employees, may require of them certain bonds, and so on, and it is reasonable that the employees should be definitely guaranteed their natural rights. In this act we are giving special privileges to certain corporations. We are definitely recognizing the Bankers' Association, which is, of course, an association of employers. We are recognizing professional associations such as that of the accountants. There seems to be no reason whatever why we should not recognize that the employees should have the right to organize. At the present time the employees of the bank are absolutely at the mercy of their employers. If they should wish at any time to ask for an increase in their wages or a betterment of their condition their case is almost hopeless. I know that theoretically they may organize, but whenever that has been attempted it has been frowned down upon by the bankers, and the men who have attempted to effect the organization have been thrown out of their positions or transferred to other positions or prevented from receiving promotion. This is what actually takes place. I have had various representations made to me from bank men both in the West and in the East in regard to this matter.

Take the question of wages. I am informed that in some of the leading banks a great many of the clerks are receiving, to start with, some $350 a year. Sometimes that is supplemented by living quarters, and in other cases it is not. I am informed that in a great many cases the wages of bank employees amount to only $500, $600, or $700 a year. I received a rather pathetic communication the other day, since introducing this matter, from a young man who stated his position. He is an employee in a bank, married, with children, and is receiving only some $1,500 a year and finds it very, very difficult indeed to manage on that.

Take, again, the question of marriage, and the conditions under which the bank clerks must live. We have the banks stipulating that a bank clerk may not marry until he has such-and-such a salary. That works out in practice, I am given to understand, that certain employees who have special friends among the bankers are able to obtain this privilege, while others are not able to do so. It seems as if any employer is going a very long way

indeed when he undertakes to dictate to his employee what his social condition shall be, whether or not he shall have the right to exercise legitimately the normal functions of manhood. These things are vital, and these conditions are very difficult to improve or alter unless you allow the employees the primary rights of freedom of speech and of association. I cannot see any good argument against such a clause being inserted. This was proposed in the Banking committee, and I am glad to know that the Finance Minister is favourable to its incorporation. I feel quite confident that a great many members of the House, irrespective of party, will feel in favour of definitely ensuring to the bank clerks that which all other people are supposed to enjoy.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 23; Nays, 42.

Section agreed to.

On section 32—One vote for each share.

Mr. GOOD: Before this clause carries, I would like to have an expression of opinion from the Minister of Finance as to the propriety of returning to a system of voting which, I understand, was in vogue in the banks some years ago, that is that there should be a limitation upon the principle of one share one vote. I think it is generally recognized among all co-operative organizations that the principle of one man one vote ought to prevail. The principle that is adopted in most joint stock companies is one share one vote. I have been informed that some years ago some of the Canadian banks voluntarily adopted a sort of compromise between the two principles so that some recognition would be given to manhood whether or not it was accompanied by dollars. I would like to have an expression of opinion from the Minister of Finance on this question.

Mr. FIELDING: Whatever might be said in favour of the principle of one man one vote in the political sense, I think when it comes to money matters the old phrase "money talks" has to be recognized. I do not think it is reasonable to say that the man who owns only one share in a bank should have the same say as the man who has two. I think that is too chimerical.

Mr. GOOD: I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me. I did not suggest that we should adopt the principle of one man one vote, but if a man had one hundred shares say, he should not be allowed voting power beyond that amount. There should be some limitation upon his voting power.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think that can be done.

Section agreed to.

On section 54—Statement to be laid before annual meeting; liabilities; assets; other particulars; profit and loss account, etc.

Mr. SPENCER: I notice that in the draft of the original bill the minister had two paragraphs, one called "appropriation account" and the other "contingent reserves, including undistributed profits." Would the minister explain why these two clauses were withdrawn?

Mr. FIELDING: After the bill was introduced we had many criticisms from all quarters. Whenever any suggestion was made that seemed to be reasonable I was very happy to concur in it. The suggestions made in regard to these paragraphs seemed to me to be reasonable. We discussed the matter in committee and the committee agreed to the changes as herein made.

Mr. SPENCER: May I ask the minister if "from all quarters" included anybody but the Bankers' Association themselves?

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, yes. I had letters and suggestions from various members of parliament, from outside citizens, suggestions came to me in a variety of ways. I think even the public press undertook to give me some advice in the matter.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister be good enough to tell us why these amendments were put in the draft bill as first brought down? Was there not some good reason for having them inserted there?

Mr. FIELDING: It seemed to me at that time, in the best light we had, that the way there proposed was the best way to deal with them. Better light came to us and we acted accordingly.

Mr. COOTE: I was just wondering if the minister would tell us where the light came from?

Mr. FIELDING: I get light from various sources, occasionally from my hon. friends, and I am very glad to avail myself of it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me there should be a provision requiring an accurate statement to be made with regard to the value of bank premises. There is no such requirement in this clause. I should like to call attention to the evidence given by Sir Edmund Walker before the committee on Banking and Commerce.

He was asked:

Q. Are the figures that are given in the returns made to the Minister of Finance, showing the value of the bank premises, exactly correct and complete?

He replied:

A. We tell our shareholders almost every year that our bank premises are entered at half their value, we tell them that our bank premises are worth twice as much as they are stated at in our statement—in the first place, they are $7,236,000, in the last statement, those are the premises that the bank owns directly, the bank owns premises through a realty company as well—that is about half of the value of those particular premises.

Q. That is the value of the premises held by the Bank of Commerce is some 15 millions?

A. About 14 or 15 million.

Q. What was the purpose of holding bank premises in the name of a holding company?

A. We had to replace the landlord that I spoke of as existing throughout Ontario, but did not exist in the West. We created a realty company, and as we built our buildings we provided out of our currency profits for half the cost of the building, and took that in stock in the realty company, and wrote that stock off. This realty company mortgaged the premises of the bank for the other 50 per cent, and the bank rented offices from the realty company at a rental which in 20 years would amortize the last of the debt.

Q. What would be the value of the holdings of your subsidiary realty company?

A. 8 or 10 millions. I think 10 millions.

The CHAIRMAN: I would call the hon. member's attention to section 147b which provides for neglecting to make a return for the value of property. This seems to be a provision of the kind the hon. member has referred to.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): And section 79 which calls for a return to the minister in regard to the value of real and immovable property.

The CHAIRMAN: There is section 147b and section 79. In the former a penalty is provided for neglecting to comply with the terms of the section.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In paragraph (r) of the clause we are now considering the statement of assets is required to show:

"bank premises, at not more than cost, less amounts (if any) written off."

It seems to me that, in some way, a fair valuation of the bank premises should be definitely required in this statement. If the statement is worth anything it should show the exact value both of the real estate held directly and that held through any holding company.

Mr. FIELDING: Paragraph (r) provides for a return of the bank premises.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the one under discussion now.

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me this matter is one of very great importance. There was a good deal of discussion about it in the committee on Banking and Commerce and I understand the Minister of Finance took the position then that so long as the real estate assets were not over valued no harm was done. I should like to dissent from that view. The banks are essentially public service corporations, and if the value of their real estate assets are written down, it is possible to conceal a very large amount of profits in those assets.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is this exception: Under section 79 the bank must every year make a return to the minister showing the fair market value of its real estate and property.

Mr. GOOD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the hon. member called my attention to that. There is that provision, but I think the House should also make provision for return in another place. Why should we not provide in the item in the clause we are now discussing that there should be a statement of the fair market value of the assets, and not have the banks possibly writing them down to a very small fraction of the real value?

I might call the attention of the committee to the other paragraphs, (m) and (n), which were withdrawn by the minister during the course of the consideration of the bill in committee. They are now hidden under a new (m) and (n)—"other current loans and discounts in Canada, after making full provision for all bad and doubtful debts," and "other current loans and discounts elsewhere than in Canada, after making full provision for all bad and doubtful debts." The point is whether or not the banks should be permitted to conceal the amounts which they have appropriated for bad and doubtful debts. I want to place myself on record as being somewhat doubtful of the decision which the committee reached in that respect, and of the propriety of following the suggestion made by the Minister of Finance in the first place that these appropriations should be disclosed in the statements.

Mr. COOTE: It would be only fair to the shareholders to have the bank premises shown in the annual statement at their fair market value rather than as it is shown at present. This statement as it is made out now is misleading. I think the shareholders are entitled to know how much of the bank's money, capital or accumulated profits, has been put into bank premises. I have here a statement issued by Dickinson & Walbank, of Montreal, in regard to the merger of the Merchants Bank with the Bank of Montreal, in which the following statement appears:

It is evident from the government reports and statements made at the meeting in February, that the entire capital of the Merchants Bank was in premises of the bank. In that case, the shareholders' equity, as shown above at $12,826,189 and $12,041,761, in December and January respectively, has against it a bonded liability on bank premises account, approximating $5,000,000 which must consequently be deducted, thus bringing the total book-value down to $7,041,761 or $67 per share, at the end of January.

In the bank returns of February 28 I observed that one bank with a paid-up capital of $15,000,000 gave its bank premises as being valued at $7,000,000, and the general manager of the bank, I believe, made the statement that the value shown is only 50 per cent of the cost of the premises. A lot of the profits or of the capital of the bank has been invested in bank premises and it is not shown in their annual statement, as it ought to be. This is misleading, and the Minister of Finance should amend paragraph (r) so as to show bank premises at their actual value or their fair market value.

Section agreed to.

On section 56—Shareholders' audit.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have an amendment to offer. I move that section 56 be amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

(17) The Governor in Council shall appoint a competent person who shall be an officer of the government with the title of Government Auditor, whose duty shall be to examine all reports of auditors made under this act and require all such auditors to report to him upon the adequacy of the procedure adopted by the bank for the safety of its creditors and shareholders, and as to the sufficiency of their own procedure in auditing the affairs of the bank, and he may enlarge or extend the scope of the audit, or direct that any other or particular examination be made or procedure established in any particular case, as the public interest may seem to require.

(18) The Government Auditor shall have all the powers of inquiry with respect to the duties to be performed by him conferred upon commissioners appointed under the Inquiries Act.

(19) The Government Auditor shall annually make report in writing to the minister of all examinations and inquiries made by and directed to be made by him and his finding and recommendations in respect thereto, and such report shall be laid before parliament within twenty-one days from the commencement of each session thereof.

After the near-failure of the Merchants Bank there was a very general request by the public as voiced through nearly all our newspapers, that there should be some more definite government audit or inspection. The amendment submitted does not look to the appointment of auditors who will go over the entire work of all the banks. That would seem to me to be quite unnecessary, and of course it would involve an enormous expenditure. That is not contemplated at all. It is proposed, though, that some one should be expressly charged with the responsibility of supervising the various bank audits and of seeing that they are standardized and are sufficiently wide in scope to cover all requirements and to bring to the notice of the minister, and subsequently of parliament, all the essential facts in the case. It has been objected by the bankers that the government is not in a position to audit the accounts of the banks, because it is not able to command the services of any one sufficiently competent for the purpose. I cannot see the validity of that objection, for the government of the country, charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the interests of the public and of the bank shareholders, should undoubtedly be able to secure the services of competent men. Further than that, it has been objected that if the government undertook such an inspection it would assume a certain responsibility. Well, that is precisely the reason why such an inspection should be made. The government cannot avoid a very considerable measure of responsibility with regard to the banks. Under this bill which we are passing the banks are given special privileges. They have almost a monopoly of the credit system of the country and, besides, they enjoy the very valuable franchise of issuing currency. Under these conditions the public have a vital interest in all that transpires in the banks.

Mr. VIEN: How can the hon. member say the banks have a monopoly when any group of persons with $500,000 can organize a bank?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If another group entered, the number of such organizations would be increased from seventeen to eighteen, and those eighteen groups would still have that monopoly.

Mr. VIEN: And why not fifty or sixty groups? There is no monopoly when it is open to any other group to come in. There is no restriction to the number of banks that may be organized.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Since the hon. member raises this question I may point out that as a matter of fact, within the last few years, instead of banks multiplying they have been reduced in number from thirty-four to seventeen; and that is a sufficient indication of the likelihood of other groups breaking into the ring. I repeat, there is virtually a monopoly on the part of the banks of giving credits to the people, and there is the further valuable franchise of the issuance of currency. Under these circumstances the government cannot escape its responsi-

bility, and it would seem that the best way of meeting the situation would be to appoint some one definitely who shall be given the responsibility of supervising the auditors. I fancy if this were done and if there was any weakness in any bank, it would be brought to the attention of the minister in time to save the situation.

One other objection that I have heard alleged against this amendment, is that the business of a bank is private in character. Surely, sufficient evidence was produced in the Banking committee and on the floor of this House last night to show that essentially the banks of to-day are in the nature of public utility corporations. Their concerns are not entirely private. With the special privileges they are granted, with the franchises and charters they are given, they can no longer be considered as carrying on a private business. The public is interested to a great extent; a section of the public as shareholders, another and larger section of the public as depositors, another and still larger section of the public as borrowers—those who technically make deposits and are given checking privileges;—these large sections of the public are tremendously interested in what is taking place. For these reasons, it is highly desirable that we should have an officer charged with keeping in close touch with the affairs of the bank, who would bring this information to the minister and to parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: We had a very full discussion of this matter before the committee. The clauses which we have already passed or which we are about to pass give adequate powers and protection to the public in the matter of audit, and I do not think it is wise to ask us to go any further.

Mr. GOOD: When this matter was under consideration in the committee, Mr. Edwards gave us some information about associations of auditors who met together from time to time to discuss methods, to standardize methods, and to confer over their work. He gave it as his opinion—and I think his opinion is certainly worth while noting—that this collaboration and conferring amongst auditors was very useful for them. It occurs to me that if a government auditor were appointed, as has been suggested in this amendment, he could very well function as a sort of presiding officer over those bank auditors who had been selected by the various banks to audit their affairs, and that in that capacity, as president or chairman, he would not in any way dominate the auditors, but he would bring them together to confer over their methods and he would also, in his position of government auditor, be able to examine their methods and to report upon them regularly to the minister. In that respect too, he should be able to convey information to the department of any incipient difficulties that might be discovered in the banks' affairs.

5 p.m.

There seem to me to be two advantages in this proposal, one the advantage of regularly reporting to the minister and to parliament, and the other, that of regular conferences—"get-togethers"—amongst the auditors. The latter advantage would, I think, very largely ensure better auditing methods, so that what has happened in the past to the Merchants Bank, as far as we have been permitted to get information on that affair, would be less likely to occur. The auditors who confer together amongst themselves and discuss their work are in a much better position to do good work than those who work in an isolated fashion. I think the suggestion is well worth considering. It would be comparatively inexpensive, and it is well worth while. I want, in conclusion, to call the attention of the committee to what the minister said in defence of turning down this proposal in the select standing committee. It has reference to the next clause 56A where it is provided that:

> The minister may direct and require any auditor appointed under the next proceeding section of this act, or any other auditor whom he may select, to examine and inquire specially into any of the affairs or business of the bank, and the auditor so appointed or selected, as the case may be, shall, at the conclusion of his examination and inquiry, report fully to the minister the results thereof.

I should like to submit to the committee and to the minister that this is very inadequate, because the minister will not order a special inquiry until he receives some information of a serious or threatening character. He will not be on his guard unless he is receiving the information regularly. The door will be shut after the horse is stolen, and the expense will have to be incurred when it is too late to correct the difficulties and mistakes. By providing for a government auditor, one who may function as president of the bank auditors at regular conferences, you are going not only to get better service on the part of the auditors but also to ensure that regularly, once in every six months or once a year, the department shall be in receipt of a report from this government auditor upon the auditing methods. It seems to me very obvious that this is a wise provision. As I said, it is not an expensive provision at all; it probably would cost very little more than the special inquiries which the minister is empowered to make at any time.

Mr. IRVINE: Before this innocent amendment moved by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) is finally slaughtered, I should like to say a word or two about it. It asks for government inspection of banks. The only thing that I do not like about it is that it asks the government to do anything. I am not very much enamoured of any proposal that places more responsibility upon government. I am in favour of government being asked to do just as little as possible: for two reasons. First, you are likely to get little from a government; second, no organized body is less capable of carrying things out in a practical way—I am not referring to the present government, I am speaking of all governments. However, this is one of the capacities in which the government might be able to act, namely, that of a policeman to walk up and down the country and club people when they violate a certain law. That is about all that is involved in this clause which is sought to be amended by my hon. friend. This has been the practice ever since governments were organized. I am in favour of the amendment. As to the right of the government to do this, there can be no question at all. As the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) said, this is one of the powers which the government, as the representative of the people, must exercise in its supervision of our banking system. Therefore, the government having the right to inspect the institution to see that it is doing what it was intended by the law to do, and being, as I believe, eminently fitted to act in the capacity of a policeman, I am in favour of this amendment.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, I think the proposal contained in the amendment cannot be as lightly dismissed as perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) would suggest. It seems to me that in the existing regulations of the Bank Act the government recognizes its responsibility in this matter by the minister being empowered, when he sees fit, to employ an auditor to investigate any bank. This amendment does not ask for a full-fledged system of government inspection, but for the appointment of a particular individual whose duty will be to do continuously what otherwise the minister under the statute can do from time to time—in the past always too late; a government auditor whose duty it is to examine the reports as they come in, as only an auditor can examine them, to ascertain any discrepancies there may be between these and former statements, to keep, as it were, a watch on the bank's affairs from time to time through the medium of its statements and otherwise from information he can obtain under the powers committed to him by the proposed section—he is an eminently desirable official. In other words, you would have a watchdog on guard all the time comparing these various financial statements, dissecting them, calling for further statements if necessary, and so relieving the minister of that burden and perhaps, in some cases, ascertaining unfortunate circumstances before any harm was done. For instance, the Merchants Bank, of which we have heard so much, issued statements from month to month, all of which were false and fraudulent. That situation existed for a period of at least six or seven months. But how can you expect any employees in the Finance department to scientifically dissect a bank's financial statements and discover whether or not they contain any discrepancy, and whether or not any investigation should be made? It may be that a government auditor appointed in the manner suggested by the member for Centre Winnipeg would be able to disclose such a situation as existed in the Merchants Bank long before the failure took place, and the minister was called in as an undertaker to look after its affairs.

Mr. STEVENS: There would be a great deal of force in the proposal of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg and in the arguments of those supporting his amendment if no amendment had been made to the provisions of the old act. But this clause which we have under consideration is almost new. There have been some vital amendments made in it, and I consider that clause 56 is perhaps the most important and significant in the whole act so far as it relates to the practice of banking in this country, and having particular reference to the Merchants Bank case. As a matter of fact, the changes now presented to the committee in this bill cover completely the discrepancies in the old act. Let me just cite one or two. Under the old act there was one auditor under the control of the banks, without any limitation. In this amended clause we have two independent auditors appointed with a very strict limitation, and in addition, in subsection 9 of clause 56 and also in clause 56A, we have the minister specifically empowered to do exactly what this amendment asks to have done. The only difference between the amendment of the hon. member and the two provisions to which I have referred is that his amendment calls for the setting up of an officer, while in these clauses the minister is

empowered to do all that the hon. member asks to have done.

Now, what I wish to impress on the committee is this—and it has certainly been very forcibly impressed upon my own mind—that by adopting the amendment proposed by the hon. member there is a danger that you make the minister, or the government, responsible for the accuracy of the bank audit. I do not think we are prepared to go that far. But under the provisions as they now stand are contained all the powers that are in this proposed amendment, only the sign of approval of the minister upon the audit to the public is not given. This is a difference and a distinction which I think is to the advantage of the public. Besides, the auditors report to the directors, and a copy of their report is then sent to the shareholders. All of this is more or less new. So I consider, Mr. Chairman, that in the amendment made by the committee to the clause as it stands we have safeguarded the various points raised in this discussion.

Amendment (Mr. Woodsworth) negatived.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, before the clause carries I would refer the committee to subsection 9, where it says:

> The minister may from time to time require that the auditors of a bank shall report to him upon the adequacy of the procedure adopted by the bank for the safety of its creditors and shareholders, and as to the sufficiency of their own procedure in auditing the affairs of the bank; and the minister may at his discretion enlarge or extend the scope of the audit, or direct that any other or particular examination be made or procedure established in the particular case as the public interest may seem to require.

It will be noticed that the minister himself is here proposing procedure under which he will incur this moral responsibility which on most occasions he apparently desires to evade as far as possible. It does seem to me that if the minister is going to have the auditors inquire into the affairs of the bank the inquiry should be made regularly before the bank comes under suspicion. I would move that subsection 9 be amended by prefixing thereto the following words:

> The auditors shall report to the minister at least once in each year upon all loans exceeding five per cent of the paid up capital of the bank, and shall state specifically whether or not in their judgment such loans are adequately secured.

It does seem to me that if the shareholders' auditor would forward to the Minister of Finance a statement covering the loans exceeding five per cent of the paid up capital of the bank and state specifically whether or not in his opinion these loans are adequately secured, we shall have taken a step toward safeguarding the interests of the banks.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): How often would that be done?

Mr. COOTE: At least once a year.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What would be the good of it if it was not done daily or weekly?

Mr. COOTE: As a rule, loans run for more than six months before they become bad. I will not attempt to urge that it is possible to safeguard a bank from bad management. But in the case of the Merchants Bank I think it could be demonstrated, if we had any investigation, that some of these loans had been bad for four years but were allowed to run on as current loans. If the auditor in the case of the Merchants Bank had been required to make a return of this kind to the minister it is possible that some of these loans would have been looked into before they got into such bad shape. There are a good many people in Canada who believe that the governments are behind the banks and that their deposits are guaranteed. That belief was expressed to me by a very intelligent woman about a week ago. I would not say that that opinion is prevalent, but it is held by some. I do not see why the Finance Minister should try so hard to evade responsibility. I think the people would like him to assume some responsibility if it would in any way help to secure the position of the banks and in that way, of course, to secure the depositors.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member has stated that quite a few people feel that the government has something to do with the banks. Well, that opinion will grow if the view expressed by some members of this committee is repeated, here or outside; and that would be unfortunate. The banks have been referred to several times today as public institutions. In one sense that is quite correct, but if by that term is meant that the state have some interest in the assets of the bank or in its control, then I say it is not correct, and that it is an unfortunate term to employ. Now, what is a bank?

Mr. COOTE: Did I use the term that the hon. member has suggested? If I did, I do not remember doing so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, I was not complaining so much about any expression used by my hon. friend as about those used by some other members of the committee.

Mr. SHAW: Sir Edmund Walker in his evidence indicated clearly that a bank is a public service corporation. Is that not so?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I suppose it is a public service corporation, but I do not think it is one which must be controlled in all its operations by the state. Some hon. gentlemen seek to develop that idea, and I say it is not in the interests of the state or of good banking. The first thing we know some people will begin to think the state is the shareholder and the depositor. The shareholders own the capital; the business is done largely on the depositors' money. The shareholders are all free individuals; they may dispose of their stock at any time; the depositor may withdraw his deposits. So, provided that we set up every safeguard we can devise for the protection of the public in their relation to the banking corporation in all its activities, we have done about all we can. What good could be served by having a bank auditor make an annual statement to the Finance department setting forth a list of the loans equal to or exceeding five per cent of the capital stock of the bank? It would be of no value, because the condition of a borrower's loan with the bank changes in some cases every week or every month—at least every three months. Why not put the responsibility upon the directors and the manager? They are following the transactions of the bank daily; they are intimately acquainted with every detail of its operations. Now, a very important clause which forms part of this section is in the act for the first time.

It reads:

> It shall be the duty of the auditors to report individually or jointly as to them may seem fit to the general manager and to the directors in writing any transactions or conditions affecting the well-being of the bank which are not satisfactory to them, and which in their opinion require rectification—

And so on. I submit that no better safeguard than that could be devised; the shareholders' auditors are required to sumbit in writing to all the directors any information respecting any account the condition of which they think may affect the welfare of the banking institution. After all, it is only those who audit frequently and who become intimately associated with the bank's methods of business who can audit properly. So I think the clause which I have read affords more protection than the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote). I further submit that it is not necessary, at least at the present time, to interject any government official into the auditing of the banks' affairs.

Mr. COOTE: Just a word in reply to the hon. member for Halifax. I would not like the committee to get the idea from what he has said that I was proposing in any way to interfere with what was proposed under subsection 10, providing for a report of the auditors to the directorate. I was simply trying to enlarge on that idea a little bit and am proposing that the return go to the minister. If the hon. member for Halifax were logical it does seem to me that he would object to subsection 9, as well as to my amendment, because under subsection 9 the minister is given power to have these auditors make a report and is assuming some responsibility in connection with the affairs of the bank. The reason, I think, that we attempt by legislation to exercise some control over the banks and their actions is because we give them very special privileges, and when we do that it seems quite proper that we should exercise some legislative control over them.

Amendment (Mr. Coote) negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 60—Cash reserves in Dominion notes.

Mr. COOTE: I would like the Finance Minister to be good enough to explain the reason for requiring the bank to hold in Dominion notes not less than forty per cent of the cash reserves which it has in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a very old provision in the Bank Act. It really amounts to a loan which the banks make to the government; that is really the effect of it.

Mr. COOTE: I do not know whether I am asking the minister for something which he is not prepared to give. I asked him if he could give us the reason why it is there. Perhaps that is asking too much.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not old enough to remember.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I then press the question and ask the minister if he is not old enough to remember why it was originally put there, can he tell us why it is there to-day?

Mr. FIELDING: It is one of the little things which we exact from the banks. The banks to that extent loan that amount of money. They have to get that amount of Dominion notes, which is equivalent to loaning the money to the Dominion government. I think my hon. friend is not anxious to give the banks greater privileges.

Section agreed to.

On section 61—Issue of notes.

Mr. COOTE: This deals with the privilege given to our banks of issuing notes. It seems to me we have come pretty near to the time in this country when the government should issue the notes on which we are to transact business. At the present time it is impossible for anybody to get any money in this country without going to the bank, and the bank can issue its own notes. I would like to point out to the Minister of Finance, and I think it may interest him, that in Australia all paper currency is issued by the Note Issue Department of the Commonwealth Bank, and the profits, which amounted in the year ending June 30, 1922, to $6,130,802, go into the federal treasury and help to reduce taxation. We have on the statute books at the present time the War Finance Act, which provides for the issuing of Dominion government notes and the furnishing of these notes to the banks against deposit of securities by the banks, and on that issue the Dominion government gets five per cent interest. Our Canadian banks have made considerable use of this privilege of securing money from the Finance department, and I do not see why that might not be gradually extended and the banks compelled to use a larger percentage of Dominion government notes to transact the business of this country, and at the same time curtail their own note issue. I think we are giving to the banks here a special privilege which is denied to any other person in this country, and I have never been able to see just how we were justified in doing that, particularly when we limit the amount of capital upon which a bank may be started to the amount of $500,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Just what would be the advantage to the country?

Mr. COOTE: The first advantage would be that the holder of a Dominion government note would know that the money it represented was as good as his country. A bank note, on the other hand, is of questionable value, or it might be. The next advantage would be that this country would secure an additional revenue of I think five or six million dollars a year if the banks were charged a rate of only three per cent. On what ground can the giving of this privilege to a bank be defended? In Australia the privilege of issuing notes has been retained by the government since the year 1910, and the banks in Australia seem to be able to function and to furnish the people with money at as low a rate of interest, and probably lower, than the banks charge in this country. I do not think that our banks are in any way making a return to us for this special privilege which they enjoy. I think some reason should be given, if there is any, why the banks should have this privilege of issuing notes. I might quote briefly from a pamphlet issued by Mr. Ward, of Winnipeg. He says:

> A bank note is simply a promise to pay. If you want to borrow money from the bank and draw the cash you hand the banker your note, which is your promise to pay, and in exchange he hands you his notes, which are also promises to pay. The chief difference between them is that you have to pay interest on your note, but he pays none on his.

Exactly how much profit the banks make on their note circulation cannot be determined, as their method of accounting does not show this, but according to the figures furnished by the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, that bank has made something over two per cent profit on its circulation.

Mr. SPENCER: Has the Minister of Finance ever given consideration to the idea of the government issuing all the notes of the country?

Mr. FIELDING: I have given no particular consideration to that theory. I think the present system is working very well, and while I give consideration, perhaps not as much as I should, to all these financial propositions, I cannot say that I have ever thought it would be at all a desirable thing to deprive the banks of this privilege.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I should like to refer to a point or two, although I do not profess to understand very thoroughly the advantages to the state in issuing its currency as against its being issued by a bank, as in this country, I think that originally the right of note issue was given to the bank for good reasons. In the early days in Canada it was desirable that bank branches should be opened in the interest of the development of the whole country. If a bank's capital had to be invested in bonds, as is required in the United States, and they had not the right of note issue, they could hardly open up agencies. And the capital was not in this country at that time to carry on business in any other way. There is no doubt in the world that the right of note issue is of some advantage to a bank. At the same time it is of some advantage to the country, because our Canadian banks could not otherwise have had anything like the present number of agencies that they have opened throughout Canada.

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. member think we would be better off if there were fewer agencies opened?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is another question altogether; possibly we would. However, we can never settle that question here, and I do not know where it can be settled. Ten years ago many of the representatives of the people in parliament were complaining that there were not enough banking facilities in Canada. Strange to say, with the passage of the last decade the complaint now is that we have too many banking agencies or offices, and there is some truth in it. But I do say that in the past, and at the present time as well, it has been of some advantage to communities to have branch banking offices opened as we have them to-day, and I do not believe it would have been possible without giving to the banks their present right of note issue. I admit it is of some advantage to them. Now, my hon. friend says it would be of some advantage to the state to issue notes. At the present time the country issues the one-dollar bill, the two-dollar bill, and the four-dollar bill, and up to the extent of $50,000,000 without requiring it to be covered by gold. In addition to that, we issue the copper and silver coin. Well, that is some advantage to the state, because we must always have till money and pocket money in circulation, and redemption is never demanded for this currency issued by the government; it is always outstanding, it can be issued freely without any fear of a demand for redemption ever being made. Above an issue of $50,000,000 our Dominion Bank Note Act requires there be dollar for dollar in gold, so if we took from the banks, say, the right of note issue of the $5 bill, under the terms of the Dominion Bank Note Act as it stands, we would have to put up gold to the extent of dollar for dollar. That is, the treasury would have to go out and buy $5 worth of gold, and against that they would issue the note and sell it to the bank. There may be some profit in it, but I do not quite see where it lies.

Mr. SPENCER: It what way would they buy?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): They would buy the gold in the gold market of the world where you can buy bullion or coin.

Mr. COOTE: Does my hon. friend refer to the issue of notes under the Finance Act of 1914?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am referring to the Dominion Bank Note Act which requires that all notes issued by the government, outside of $50,000,000, must be covered by gold, dollar for dollar. Of course, that provision has been modified by the Finance Act of 1914.

Section agreed to.

On section 64—Bank circulation redemption fund continued.

Mr. COOTE: In regard to subsection 6, which provides that the circulation fund shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, it does seem to me rather an imposition to ask this country to pay interest on the circulation redemption fund. I would therefore move that subsection 6 be struck out. For this reason, Mr. Chairman: The banks are given the privilege of issuing notes to the amount of their paid-up capital. The privilege that they get there is surely worth the little bit of interest, they would lose on the money deposited with the government.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is a cheaper rate than the rate at which the government can borrow money from the banks.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, but the advantage to the banks of being able to issue their own notes will compensate for any loss they may sustain in this connection.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to support the amendment. We have given the banks sufficient privileges without adding this one to the number. The circulation fund might well rest with the government without paying any such interest to the banks.

Mr. IRVINE: I shall support the amendment and will not occupy time unnecessarily by speaking in its favour.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 76—Business and powers of the Bank.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I move an amendment to paragraph (d) of subsection 2 of section 76 by inserting after the word "bank" in the third line of the paragraph the following words:

> Or any agent or other person acting on behalf of the aforementioned officers, managers, clerks or servants of the bank.

The intention is to safeguard as fully as possible the principle involved in the amendment which was carried by the committee. Owing possibly to an oversight in the committee and in the drafting of the original amendment, adequate provision does not seem to have been made for what I conceive to

be a legal possibility of brokers or agents of the managers or clerks securing these loans. That is the reason for the amendment I offer, which in no way affects the section.

Mr. BAXTER: I would ask the hon. member this: If any one lends to the agent of a man does he not lend to the man himself? The amendment is only an addition of words that in my judgment are absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The words may not be absolutely necessary, but as they do not in any way alter the principle involved they can do no possible harm, while I think they may do some good.

Mr. PARENT: The hon. member might suggest the words "directly or indirectly." They would probably convey the same meaning, while they have the merit of brevity.

Mr. SHAW: That refers only to security.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think the words proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Garland) are needed. As the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) has pointed out, the section as it stands now would cover any application for a loan or any loan actually made.

Mr. BAXTER: Further, how is the bank to know in all cases that it is lending to an agent for a principal?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think this is only another example of the futility of trying to legislate against all possible evasions of an act, and such meticulous nicety can get you nowhere.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member, I think, is imagining futility before he has proof of it. I suggest that we allow the words to be inserted, because, as I have stated, they can do no harm and they may do some good. I am ready to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Parent), and I would propose the words "directly or indirectly" in substitution for what I have already submitted.

Mr. BAXTER: On the principle suggested by the hon. member there would be no reason why the Ten Commandments should not also be inserted: they can do no possible harm and they might conceivably do some good.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Would the words "directly or indirectly" be satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Garland)?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, provided they are inserted in the proper place.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will the hon. member answer my question first? Is he satisfied with the words "directly or indirectly?"

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, they are there now.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Where?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): At the top of the subsection:

> Except as authorized by this act, the bank shall not, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, but they are not included in subsection (d).

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Oh, yes; you read them into subsection (d).

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member desire to drop his amendment?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I might as well. I desire to move a further amendment to the subsection 3. The subsection now reads:

> 3. No agent or manager of any bank shall act as agent for any insurance company or for any person in the placing of insurance, nor shall any bank exercise pressure upon any borrower to place insurance for the security of such bank in any particular insurance agency, but nothing herein contained shall prevent such bank from requiring such insurance to be placed with an insurance company which it may approve.

I move to amend this by adding after the word "bank" in the third line the words, "nor any officer or employee of any bank." In the last line of the subsection I would have all the words deleted after the word "placed." The intention of the first insertion is obvious. The deletion of the last words I recommend to the committee because otherwise there would continue a practice that now prevails of discrimination against the mutual insurance companies; and we know only too well in western Canada that a grave injustice has been done to these companies in this regard. When you go into a bank to secure a loan, we admit, the bank is right in asking you to take out insurance upon your crop or upon whatever the loan may be given. But we do not admit the right of the bank to state in what company the loan insurance shall be placed. You are giving them that full right in this, to the detriment, I say, of the mutual insurance companies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Supposing a bank was interested in an insurance policy to be placed by way of security against a loan,

or insurance against loss of property pledged as security for a loan, surely the lending party, in this case the bank, would have the right of saying, for instance, that they would not allow that insurance to be placed in a company the solvency of which was very much doubted. That is the purport of this clause.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would not object to that idea in the least, but I say that this clause, as at present drafted and under the present practice of banks in western Canada, will react against the interest of the mutual insurance companies. We are very anxious to develop the mutual insurance companies, and this will work an injustice upon them.

Mr. GARDINER: I have had a little experience with this proposal as outlined by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). I remember some years ago when I was doing business with a bank, that if I went into the bank in the spring and asked for a loan, the manager of the bank would say to me: "Yes, I will give you a loan, but you must put hail insurance on your crop." The effect of that was that the manager acted as agent and he collected the commission. If you were not willing to put on hail insurance through the particular company that he was representing, the manager would invariably turn down your application for a loan, no matter in what financial circumstances you might be. I could give the committee many cases where—

Mr. STEVENS: This is exactly what the Banking committee wrestled with and corrected in this clause. If the hon. member will read the first part of the clause, he will see that it covers all this.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 208 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jane Edna Near.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill No. 221 (from the Senate), respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Hudson.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 83 respecting banks and banking, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 76, subsection 3. The question is on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland).

Mr. FIELDING: I think it has been shown by the discussion, Mr. Chairman, that what the mover of the amendment is aiming at is already covered by the section as it stands.

Mr. GARDINER: When we rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) and was attempting to point out certain restrictions that I believe should be imposed on branch bank managers acting as agents for insurance companies. I have some information in regard to this particular matter that I know to be correct. Some five or six years ago branch bank managers used to act as agents for hail insurance companies, and many farmers desiring to get loans had to place their hail insurance with the company represented by the bank manager before any accommodation was granted them. A year or two later the bank accountant took the place of the manager as insurance agent. Under these conditions we can well understand that it is not in the best interests of the banks themselves that this practice should continue, for I know of many farmers who because they placed their hail insurance as required by the bank's officials received loans which they were not entitled to, while other farmers, not desiring to place their hail insurance through the particular company represented by the manager or accountant of the bank, were refused the accommodation that they were justly entitled to. Therefore it is necessary to include in this particular section any employee of the bank, otherwise some employee will merely become agent for the manager, and I think this part of the amendment should be accepted.

With regard to the latter part of the amendment, to delete all the words, "with an insurance company which it may approve," I think this also should be accepted. We find that many managers of branch banks in the West discriminate against mutual insurance companies. We have some very fine mutual companies in western Canada, and the branch bank managers, usually being interested in one of the ordinary line companies, refuse to accept insurance in these mutual companies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is it not a fair condition for anyone to require that an insurance policy shall not be carried in a mutual company? Many people do not desire that insurance in which they are interested

shall be taken out in a mutual company. Surely it is not fair to force them to accept such insurance? There are many strong mutual companies, but on the other hand many of them are doubtful—some are not even that.

Mr. GARDINER: In reply to the hon. member, I would say that we have many sound mutual companies in western Canada. But whether they are sound or not makes no difference to the branch managers, they object to the insurance being placed through these companies. The municipal Hail Insurance Company of the province of Alberta is to all intents and purposes a mutual company, and it is one of the strongest hail insurance companies in the province. This organization is really composed of the rural municipalities in Alberta. It carries about 55 per cent of the hail insurance in that province, and the rates are much lower than those charged by the ordinary line companies. Its operations have been very successful. Moreover, this organization gives its insurance on time; the rate is not set until the losses are known in the fall. The rate is applied as a tax on the land, consequently the security is of the best. Our branch managers, of course, object very strongly to that class of insurance, notwithstanding the fact that it enables the farmer who cannot pay for insurance on his crop in the spring to get the insurance on time, and to get it at cost, the rate being considerably less than that at which the line companies can carry the risk. I therefore suggest that the amendment proposed by the member for Bow River should be accepted. It would be in the interests of the banks themselves, and I am satisfied that it would be in the interests of the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. LEWIS: I think the amendment should receive the support of the committee. I happen to be secretary-manager of a mutual hail insurance company in Saskatchewan. In fact, I, in company with a few others in Saskatchewan, was the first to start a mutual hail insurance company in that province. I believe there are two such companies in existence now. Some years ago the banks were quite willing to accept our insurance as collateral security, but during the past few years some bank managers or accountants have become agents for various other companies and have refused to accept our insurance; they will only lend money to the farmers to buy insurance in the companies they represent. To that extent it seems to me they are catering to the capitalistic companies and, in another respect, are endeavouring to destroy any mutual arrangement we may make among ourselves for our own protection. We need to encourage co-operation among the farmers, and this is but one instance of co-operation. I may give a little history in regard to our company: Where the line companies have a 6 per cent rate or an 8 per cent rate where there is a note, during the last six years the company I represent has paid every loss in full and has at no time charged a higher average rate than 3 per cent. In one year when we had a heavy loss we charged 4 per cent, but in other years we have charged as low as 1½ per cent. We have carried that insurance; we have paid all losses. It does seem to me that this clause gives the banks and their agents an opportunity to discriminate against mutual insurance. I feel sure that in this regard we should have the support of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), who believes in co-operation. I trust that this amendment will pass, not simply because it comes from this side, but because it will give a fair deal to our mutual insurance societies in the West. I hope the committee will see to it that there is no discrimination against any mutual hail insurance company organized among the farmers for their own protection.

Mr. McBRIDE: I am fully in sympathy with this amendment. The mutual insurance companies out West are certainly doing good business, and they are making it possible for a great many people in the rural districts to carry insurance that otherwise could not afford to carry insurance. No one should be under an obligation to insure with the banks; in fact, it should be against the law for the banks to require that to be done. However, it was not on that point that I rose to say a few words. I think this government would be well advised to appoint a commission of, say, three persons to look after the bank interests and banking generally in this country. I would suggest that one member of the commission be appointed by the government, one by the banks themselves, and the third possibly by the prairie farmers. As it was brought out in the evidence before the Banking committee, that it is by them that credit is most needed, I think a commission of that kind could do good work. They might be empowered to prevent the duplication of banks in small villages and thus go a long way toward reducing the costs of the banking system. I know certain locations where there are three banks but not enough work for one. If the banks and branches were charged a

license, such a commission as I suggest could exercise control by being able to cancel the license at any time when in their opinion there were too many banks, or to prevent a bank being started in a place where one was not needed. If it is possible in this way to reduce the expenses of the banks in the outlying districts, the banks would be given a chance to make loans at a lower rate. I am not moving an amendment to this effect, but I think it is something that ought to be considered by the government.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The purpose of the section as it now stands is to prevent any agent or manager of a bank from acting as an insurance agent; he is prohibited from collecting insurance. This is a new section. The principle involved is very doubtful, as was suggested by some hon. members in the committee. However, the committee decided to adopt the clause, and that, I presume, is satisfactory to hon. members here; at least, there is no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: What is implied in the word "agent"?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): A man who is carrying on or conducting a business at any place on behalf of a bank; a man who represents a bank as agent or manager. The latter part of the clause enables the bank to give its approval or disapproval of any insurance which has to be written and in which they are interested. Well, you cannot very well take that power from a bank. If I were lending money on real estate I would insist that the borrower insure the premises upon which the money was being lent. It is only fair to leave to the bank the right to insist that the insurance be placed in a solvent company. The mortgagor may want that insurance placed in a company which the public generally know to be insolvent or the solvency of which at least is doubtful. You cannot take that right away from a man, and it should not be taken away from a bank.

We have heard something about the mutual hail insurance companies in the West. I know nothing of them. Mutual insurance companies may be very strong to-day, but when they fail they are gone, they are no good, and they do frequently fail. I remember when I was a boy there were mutual marine insurance companies in the province of Nova Scotia. They were quite a common thing, but none are to be found to-day. So long as mutual insurance companies can pay their liabilities they are all right, but when they fail to do that, they are no good. They are not as good as the old line insurance companies as a rule, especially when those old line companies have built up a reserve. But what I say is that the first part of the section effects the intentions and desires of the special committee and apparently meets with the approval of this committee. The latter part of the clause leaves with the bank that is interested in any insurance that is to be placed the right of approving or disapproving of the company selected. Now can that right be fairly taken away from a bank? It cannot be taken away from the ordinary individual engaged in busniess, and if the principle is sound in the one case I think it is sound in the other. I think the committee should adhere to the section as it stands.

Mr. FIELDING: This is another case where under the guise of restricting the bank you are in effect restricting the borrower, because if the borrower is not prepared to meet the terms of the bank regarding insurance he will not get the loan. So by placing such a restriction the borrower may not get his loan at all. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River) If the Minister of Finance and the committee decline to accept the amendment I venture to assert here that the result will be that you will deal a disastrous blow to the mutual insurance companies of western Canada, possibly of all Canada, but certainly of western Canada. Our experience out there is that the banks will not if it is possible to avoid it, allow the insurance to be taken out in mutual insurance companies. When we tell you that is a fact, and that we are anxious to develop these mutual companies, that it is in the interests of agriculture and of Canada that we should develop them, are you going to help us or not? The matter is really up to this committee. I think it will be a fatal mistake if this amendment is not accepted.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no discrimination against mutual insurance companies or any other companies. There is simply a recognition of the right of the lender to require that the property shall be insured in a company satisfactory to him. If you do not satisfy him he will say: Very well, gentlemen, if you cannot meet me in that way I do not want to lend you the money. Under the guise of aiming at restricting the bank you are in effect going to restrict the borrower and prevent him from getting a loan when the bank is ready to give it to him.

Mr. FORKE: The argument of the minister sounds plausible but in actual practice

it does not work out that way. My knowledge of loan companies and banks is that they generally do their insurance business with certain companies, and no matter what the rates are those are the companies they deal with. I would be inclined to support this amendment even at the risk of the borrower not being able to get the loan.

Mr. FIELDING: You are not the borrower

Mr. FORKE: I might be.

Mr. SPENCER: The Minister of Finance says that if the customer will not meet the banker's wishes in regard to taking out insurance with a certain company he may not get his loan. It would be just as well to point out here how very serious the situation is. The client, whoever he may be, has only seventeen institutions in the whole of Canada to go to for a loan. Those seventeen institutions have a monopoly of the business, and it is putting a tremendous weapon in their hands to allow them to dictate to a customer the company he shall insure with.

Mr. LEWIS: I might point out that these mutual insurance companies are operating under provincial charter recognized by the provincial government. They have the legal right to insure, and certain conditions have to be met before they can be organized into a mutual company. It seems to me they have a right to be on the same footing as the other insurance companies.

Mr. GOOD: The farmers in my district in Ontario are almost entirely insured in mutual farmers' companies so far as fire, wind and weather are concerned. We have no hail insurance in Ontario, but I can assure the Minister of Finance that so far as I know, it is the almost universal practice in Ontario for the farmers to insure with the mutual companies. It seems to me that the passage of this clause as it stands would leave very considerable powers in the hands of the chartered banks if they wished to use them amiss. If there were no connection between the directorates of banks and the directorates of the larger insurance companies the danger would not be so great, but as has been pointed out more than once there are interlocking directorates, and for this reason it is not improbable that there may be a general understanding that a certain bank will insist on the property being insured in the company in which it is interested, and in that way discriminate most unfairly against a company that may be absolutely sound. I do not know what would be lost by leaving the matter open and not stating specifically that the insurance shall be placed with an insurance company which the bank may approve If you leave that out, the other party to the transaction has an equal chance in the bargaining at all events. I would think it would be well worth doing.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 28; Nays, 46.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to make just one remark in regard to paragraph (f) of section 76. This is a new subsection which I think was brought in by the Minister of Finance as the result of an amendment which I had offered previously and which was left over from one meeting to another for some improvement. The amendment as originally proposed I think required the unanimous approval of all the directors present at a special meeting called for the particular purpose of approving of the loan. So far as I can see the amendment which is now incorporated in this bill is practically useless so far as achieving the effect that was sought, because now the loan may be approved at a regular meeting of the board and it is possible that not more than three members out of a large board may be present at this regular meeting. The other directors will have absolutely no notice of the meeting, will know, possibly, nothing of the loan and will be able to say, after the bank got into difficulty that they knew nothing about the matter. It seems to me that we have spoiled the whole effect of the amendment by omitting to require the notice which, in the amendment as originally proposed, was required to be given to all directors that this loan would be passed on at the meeting of the board. I should like to point that out to the Minister of Finance. I do not know whether the change in the clause was made at a meeting of the committee or not.

Mr. GOOD: When this matter was under consideration in the Banking and Commerce committee I submitted that some notice, at all events, of this particular business should go out to the directors before they could authorize the loan at the meeting called. As the clause now reads, you simply have to have a regular meeting or a special meeting, but there is nothing said about sending out notice to the directors that business of such and such a nature will be up for consideration at either meeting. I do not quite agree with the hon. member for McLeod, if I understood him rightly, in insisting that this business should be settled only at a special meeting, but I do think that the directors ought to be given notice of the particular kind

of business to be transacted. If a notice of that character were sent out I should think the worst feature of the present amendment would be eliminated. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he would not consider making that slight change, and require that notice of the particular business to be transacted should be sent out?

Mr. FIELDING: The point was considered in committee, but I really do not think the suggested change is necessary. We are bound to assume with this clause in the law that the directors will understand their responsibility, and as a rule it will be found that the directors are not going to be so negligent of their duty in the future as they have been in the past. I really do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we can make this clause much more effective than it now is.

Mr. STEVENS: May I point out to the minister also that we have already passed a clause requiring the auditors to report to the directors where any loan exceeds one per cent of the paid-up capital of the bank.

Section agreed to.

On section 80—Mortgages and hypotheques of realty and agreement of sale.

Mr. KELLNER: In the Banking and Commerce committee I brought forward an amendment to the effect that a chattel mortgage should not apply to any goods which were exempted under provincial statute, and I think it was the sense of the committee that the exemptions proposed went a little too far; I believe they would have accepted the exemption simply of personal property. I changed the amendment to cover only personal property, but the chairman asked me to defer the amendment for the time being and it never came up again. I should like to move that amendment now.

That section 80 be amended by adding after the word "property" in the third line thereof the following:

"Provided however that no mortgage or hypotheque shall be taken, held or disposed of in respect to or be deemed to include any property which by any statutory provincial enactment is exempt from seizure under writs of execution."

I should like to make a little further explanation of that. The custom in the West has been—where a farmer, in particular, gives a mortgage on his farm stock and implements—in the avent of having to foreclose, to take all he possessed, and there have been some men who have had to leave their farms without any equipment whatever. I should think it would be in the interest of the country to leave them at least this small amount of stock in order to enable them to carry on. I do not think it is any material benefit to the bankers to have it, because I do not think they lend money on such a small amount of goods at all. In other words, in case this farmer made an application for a loan, and the banks were satisfied those goods were all he had I am quite satisfied he would not get a loan on them at the present time. I may say that I have consulted several men from the West in regard to this amendment and they have invariably supported the idea embodied therein. This amendment had favourable consideration in the committee on Banking and Commerce and, I think, is entitled to receive favourable consideration from this committee to-night.

Mr. LEWIS: I wish to say a few words in regard to a matter that was brought to my attention in the West some time ago. For example, a man received a very large loan from a bank and gave as security a great many farms that he happened to own. In consequence of not being able to pay this loan the bank took over and worked those farms themselves. They took everything the farms produced and then absolutely refused to pay the taxes. They had the farms, they had the produce which came from those farms, but they refused to pay the taxes. As a result the lands were sold for taxes at a tax sale, but the man who owned them had absolutely no chance to redeem them because the bank had taken absolutely everything those farms produced. I say the banks should not be allowed to enjoy this power. They should not be allowed to take a man's property and everything it produces and refuse to pay the taxes incurred.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How many farms did he own?

Mr. LEWIS: I understand he got a loan of $50,000 and gave in security farms representing a value of $150,000. The bank had ample security but nevertheless acted in the manner I have described.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How much cash did this man pay to get these farms?

Mr. LEWIS: I understand the man owned the farms but he got a loan of $50,000 to carry on.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Then he gambled in farming?

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps he did, but there are lots of hon. members opposite who gamble too.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think the hon. member for Swift Current has strengthened the case by the example which he brought out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FORKE: The man to whom he refers was a pretty large speculator when he went into the business on the scale he did, and I think the case is not going to have very much effect in influencing the committee. But I really have sympathy with the small farmer, the man who is farming on a small scale, who gets into difficulties and whose property is seized. I do not think it would work any great hardship to the banks if the small amount of personal property was exempted as asked for in the amendment.

Mr. VIEN: Does not my hon. friend think that would work against the borrower more than against the bank? The bank does not lend except on security, and if you exclude such security as the borrower is in a position to offer, and which may happen to be unattachable under the law, does not the hon. member think that the borrower's credit will be accordingly restricted?

Mr. FORKE: I was not a member of the committee on Banking and Commerce but I hazard the suggestion that this very objection has been raised a great many times. Of course, just as surely as you place a restriction on the scope of the bank's lending you limit to some little extent the possibility of the borrowers being able to secure loans. But in law and equity, and in legislating in the public interest, it is sometimes well for us to protect people even against themselves; and I really do not think that it would work any hardship whatever to provide that a few personal belongings of some man who is down and out should not be potential security against any loan he might wish to obtain. These few belongings would make no difference whatever to the bank; the bank would not consider them as security.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): We should no doubt all like to see transactions of the kind to which my hon. friend has referred dealt with in the fashion he suggests, but we must build our laws on a sound basis which will stand the test of reason. If we carelessly put into the statute enactments of one kind or another that are illogical and that have no sound basis, the inevitable result will be that our laws will become the laughing stock of the country. The case in point is that the bank loans money and takes a mortgage on movable personal property

The hon. member who proposes the amendment wishes to provide that when the debt becomes due the bank shall not be able to exercise its right under the mortgage; that is to say, it shall not foreclose on that part of the property of the borrower which is not subject to execution under judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I understand that to be the purport of the amendment. If I am wrong, then of course my remarks are irrelevant. That may be all right; but do not let us give the bank the power to loan money on the security of certain property and then say that it cannot exercise its right under that security. Let us go back to section 76 and incorporate a prohibition to the effect that loans shall not be made on the security of property which is not leviable under writ of execution.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): All right; hear, hear.

Mr. SHAW: Would not the proposed amendment have exactly the same effect?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think my hon. friend appreciates the point I make.

Mr. VIEN: I think that the proposal which the chairman of the Banking committee (Mr. Maclean) has just suggested was fully discussed in committee and rejected for the simple reason that it did not in any way tend to injure the banks but would rather hurt the prospective borrower. In the province of Quebec there are certain personal effects which are declared unattachable under judgment. At first the courts decided that a tenant could not waive the unattachable privilege in respect of certain goods. But we found afterwards that tenants could not secure premises to rent because they had nothing to offer as a guarantee, and finally the system worked to the detriment of poor people who, wanting tenements were unable to secure them under this condition. I think the same thing applies to the proposed amendment. If you prevent a man from giving as security whatever he has, whether in the way of personal effects or otherwise, you restrict his borrowing power and thus impose a hardship upon him.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. member might tell us what amount of property is exempted in his province, so that we might be able to gauge the extent to which the individual might be able to obtain credit if the proposed amendment were adopted.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member will have to consult the court procedure of the province of Quebec to find out what exemption is made in regard to bed and bedding, and so forth.

Mr. IRVINE: I was asking the other hon. member.

Mr. VIEN: The exemption amounts to $50 in the case of personal effects and $200 in professional tools or the instruments by which a man earns his living. But I do not see that the question has any bearing on the subject before the Chair.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I may be wrong, and if so hon. members opposite will correct me; but I think it came out in the committee that in the province of Alberta a quarter of a section of land in a larger block was not liable to seizure under execution; and that is a very strange provision of law which does not obtain anywhere else. The proposition is that if a man voluntarily gives, as additional security on a loan due the bank, a mortgage on a quarter of a section of land, he may say that the bank has no right to foreclose on that quarter section. That was the point that we had before the committee and it was objected to.

Mr. KELLNER: I remember that this was what defeated the amendment before the committee. But I would point out that I am leaving out the real property. Nothing is referred to except the horses or the oxen required to put in a crop, the seed necessary for the crop, the necessary clothing, furniture and household goods, food for the family during six months, to include grain and flour, harness, and two ploughs. I do not think that this amount of equipment would be of any great value to a bank, and I remember pointing out in detail to the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) in committee that we were not restricting the credit which a man might get. If what I have enumerated were all the assets which a man had to give to a bank in western Canada for a loan to-day, I think I may safely assert that he could not get the loan of a postage stamp.

Mr. FIELDING: I suggest that we let the section stand. We shall return to it later.

Section stands.

On section 83—Property to be sold within certain time.

Mr. SHAW: Does the bank hold much property under this particular section for which further extensions are required as provided for in the act?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not answer my hon. friend offhand. If it is desired I can get the returns. This is not a very common thing. The banks take these properties as securities for loans and if the market is unfavourable, they ask for an extension of time. There is no object to be gained by asking a bank to sell property at a sacrifice. Such transactions occur so seldom that I cannot say much offhand about them, but I shall be glad to get the information at a later stage.

Mr. LEWIS: Is it the usual procedure, when we are passing a bill of this magnitude through committee, that you, Sir, simply name the clause and say "carried," or have we time to read the clause and look into the matter? I have been in this House for two sessions, and I have seen certain bills passed through, but the Chairman has read the clauses.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member say that the Chairman, as a rule, reads the clauses in committee of the whole?

Mr. LEWIS: I have heard them read.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not and never has been the practice.

Section agreed to.

On section 86—Warehouse receipts and bills of lading.

Mr. GOOD: Has the committee a right to ask the Chairman to read a clause?

The CHAIRMAN: If the committee decides by vote that the Chairman shall read the clauses he will do so. He is only bound to read the marginal notes.

Section agreed to.

On section 88, subsection 1—Loans to certain wholesale dealers.

Mr. KELLNER: What is the idea of having loans to wholesale dealers in subclause 1, then inserting subclause 2 in connection with loans to farmers upon grain, and then going back to the wholesaler in subclause 3?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Subclause 3 refers to the manufacturer, the man who converts the raw material into a manufactured article, and who desires a loan covering the period during which the manufactured process is going on.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 88, subsection 7—Same rights as upon warehouse receipts.

Mr. GOOD: I think, in the standing committee, there was a notice of motion for reconsideration in regard to part of subclause 7. I should like to know if the matter is to come up now or what is to be done with it?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The notice of motion for reconsideration was ruled out of order by the chairman of the committee at the time, and the amendment as passed by the committee was allowed to stand as it stands now.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wonder if the hon. gentleman would be willing to give us the assurance that this amendment of his will not die in the Senate.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Personally I wish that it should live. If I can do anything when it goes to the Senate, I will do so. If the Senate kills it, I am not responsible; I shall be no party to its being killed.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to ask the Minister of Finance or the chairman of the Banking committee if it is proposed that this should stand as it is found in the bill.

Mr. FIELDING: I would rather expedite the bill than have a debate on this matter. Therefore I am not going to oppose this subclause.

Mr. SHAW: Is the Minister of Finance satisfied with this subclause?

Mr. FIELDING: Not entirely. If I had been voting on it in the committee, I would have voted against it. I do not, however, think it is a matter of vital importance, and I am not going to move to strike it out. If anyone else wants to raise the question, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) is very curious about the matter. It was suggested to me that possibly the Banking committee of the Senate might have an opportunity of bringing further evidence upon this question. I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the amendment should be struck out, and if anybody wishes to move that now, I will support such a motion. I think we really ought to do that.

Mr. FIELDING: I think we can safely let the subclause stand and let it go to the Senate. If they can get further information on the question, that is a perfectly proper thing for them to do. This bill has been so well coopered up that there is not much for the Senate to do. Therefore, I think we might allow it to go to the Senate and give them an opportunity of doing some work on it.

Subsection agreed to.

Section agreed to.

On section 88, subsection 10—First lien upon seed grain and crop.

Mr. LEWIS: I am just wondering whether this is altogether in order, but it seems to me that if a person gets up on this side of the House he is immediately told that reason and logic are on the other side. As regards this subclause, I understand the bank does not have the first lien upon threshed grain. The man who threshes the grain has the first charge against it. He has the preferential and first lien upon the crop after it is severed from the ground and threshed. According to the law in Saskatchewan, the man who threshes the grain has the first charge against it, and then the bank's lien comes second.

9 p.m.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think the rights covered by this clause would prevail.

Mr. LEWIS: If they prevail, then no man will get his crop threshed. Supposing a man owns a crop and he wants another man to come and thresh it. Unless the man who is asked to thresh the grain is assured that he will have the first chance to get his pay, he will not thresh it. The man who threshes the grain has a claim before that of any bank.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I suppose for labour he would.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not think there is any change in this.

Mr. GOOD: Does that mean that the law has been and is being violated? This matter ought to be cleared up.

Mr. LEWIS: I think any of the western members even on the other side of the House will bear me out that the thresher's lien is the first lien.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Subclause 7 provides that the bank's lien shall prevail except as to wages, salaries or other remuneration unpaid for three months previously.

Mr. LEWIS: When we are speaking of reason and logic, there is only one first and preferential claim. There are not two first claims. If there is an anomaly in this subclause, we can easily remove it.

Mr. SPENCER: I have in my hand the result of a case that, I think, came up under

this very subclause in Provost the other day. In regard to Haan vs. Bank of Montreal I have the following:

A very interesting case was decided at the sitting of the district court which was held in Provost last Thursday before His Honor Judge Lees. The case was at the suit of Lambert Haan against the Bank of Montreal.

Haan alleged that the Provost manager of the defendant bank had agreed to pay his thresh bill on some 1,400 bushels of wheat which the bank had received. The bank denied making the agreement and claimed that for various reasons Haan's threshing lien was invalid. The court, however, held both that the agreement had been made and that Haan's threshing lien was in order and gave Haan judgment against the bank for the amount of his claim and costs.

I think that covers the point completely, Mr. Chairman.

Subsection agreed to.

Section agreed to.

On section 88, subsection 12—Loan for live stock raising.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would call the attention of my hon. friend from East Edmonton (Mr. Kellner) to the fact that this subsection has something to do with the amendment which we were discussing a few moments ago. Does it meet his case in any degree?

Mr. KELLNER: The amendment in this particular subsection is all right. The other amendment was slightly different.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 89, subsection 2—Prior claim of bank over unpaid vendor.

Mr. GOOD: Is there any inconsistency between this and the other amendment in section 88 that was allowed to stand over?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 91, subsection 1—Interest at 7 per cent may be charged.

Mr. SHAW: This subsection received very lengthy consideration in the special committee, but the matter is of such importance that I think it merits further consideration by this committee. The first question which naturally occurs to one when approaching a restrictive interest clause is whether or not it is proper to have such a clause in the act. I am frank to confess that if the law of supply and demand operated, and the forces of competition were actively at work, there would be little value in a section of this character. I recall that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) in the discussion of the principle of this clause before the special committee harked back to the Middle Ages in order to get some comfort for his view that such a restriction should not be imposed. He called to his aid Bacon and, strange to say, he also placed great reliance on the remarks of Adam Smith, although just why he singled out that great political economist as an authority on this particular subsection alone is rather difficult to understand. However, it is perfectly clear that Bacon wrote long before the days of organized banking, and Adam Smith wrote many years before the industrial revolution in England changed the whole industrial and economic fabric, before the day of mergers, trusts and other combinations of capital which have largely resulted in monopoly.

There can be no doubt that at the present time our banking system is a monopoly. This parliament has created certain corporations to which are delegated the business of banking, and it has prohibited all others from engaging in the business except on compliance with certain conditions. Unless a corporation has received the imprimatur of this parliament and has complied with the provisions of the Bank Act it cannot carry on a banking business. I disagreed with the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) this afternoon when he practically suggested that a banking corporation stands in exactly the same position as any other corporation. A banking corporation is a public service institution. It was so stated by Sir Edmund Walker before the special committee, and he is perhaps one of the greatest of our authorities on banking. Such a corporation derives large monopolistic and special privileges from the people of Canada, including the privilege of issuing bank notes, which is of great value to it from a financial point of view. A banking corporation, to my mind, is in substantially the same position as a railroad corporation. The latter must comply with the provisions of the Railway Act in detail, and under that act the rates which it may charge for the transportation of passengers and freight are regulated by our Board of Railway Commissioners. When one has in mind the monopolistic nature of the business and the conditions which exist to-day in the way of mergers and combinations of capital, it is reasonable to urge that a maximum interest rate should be fixed. I do not say that the rate chargeable on a particular transaction should be determined, but certainly a maximum controlling interest rate should be established. Parliament has recognized that principle for many years. Not only do we fix a maximum interest rate in the Bank Act, but in the Interest Act we fix what we call the legal rate; in the Pawnbrokers Act we fix the maximum interest charge which can be made by a pawnbroker, and similarly

in the Money Lenders Act. So I say that regardless of how we may view the principle, under the circumstances it is essential that a maximum rate be fixed. That brings me to a consideration of the present section in the Bank Act. This section has been in the Bank Act for many years in a similar form. One would think from a casual reading of the provision that it was very clear and very definite that the bank could not exact a higher rate of interest than 7 per cent. But the section as it stands is burdened by a decision of the Privy Council which gives an altogether different interpretation to it. The case I have in mind was decided, I think, in 1913, immediately prior to the last revision of the Bank Act; I believe it was referred to in the discussion at that time. In that case the Privy Council held that the bank might charge any rate that it could agree upon with the borrower, notwithstanding the provisions of section 91. They held also that as the borrower knew that the charging of an excessive rate was illegal, he was therefore estopped from recovering back any amount in excess of the fixed rate. So that the section, although apparently clear in its wording, means something altogether different from what that wording indicates. The section has no teeth at all; it simply provides a smoke screen behind which the banks can charge excessive rates. In the case to which I refer it was also decided that if a bank charging a rate of interest in excess of the statutory rate, sought to recover, it would be able to recover only 5 per cent per annum, the legal rate. But the banks, in order to prevent any possibility of recovery back, and any possible loss, discounted the notes in advance so that the borrower was estopped from setting up any claim to the excess interest charged. Now, that is the situation in regard to the present section. It is ineffective for the purposes for which it was framed. It is useless; it is simply a deception; it is a camouflage which permits the banks to charge any rate upon which they can agree with the borrower.

Now, the section has been abused. As I suggest, the banks, in order to get round the section, have charged discount rates in advance. It was brought out in an investigation conducted in Alberta a year or so ago that there was apparently some understanding among the banks with regard to this discount rate. Where previously there had been no arrangement regarding this practice, it appears that within the last year or so the banks have universally adopted the practice of discounting. That practice is very objectionable indeed to borrowers; it simply means that when a borrower goes to a bank for $100 and gives a note for that amount, he will probably get—I am speaking of Alberta at the present time—$91, and then at the end of the three months' period he will be called upon to pay the full $100. In other words, it simply means taking the interest in advance.

Mr. STEVENS: That would be at the rate of about 36 per cent. My hon. friend must mean 9 per cent per annum.

Mr. SHAW: Yes; I thank my hon. friend for calling my attention to that. I mean at the rate of 9 per cent per annum; the result would be that the borrower would get the amount he applied for, less $2.75. In addition, the banks have followed the practice of compounding the rates of interest. That is not particularly objectionable except when a high interest rate is charged, in which event, as hon. members will appreciate, the interest amounts to a very substantial sum indeed. The banks have charged very high rates of interest in the western provinces. I do not know what the situation is in eastern Canada. I understand that practically all loans there are made at the rate of 7 per cent or less, and that ample money is available to borrowers at that rate. In western Canada, within my memory at least, we have never been able to borrow money from the banks at less than 8 per cent per annum, unless, perhaps, in the case of a few choice and favoured borrowers. During the last two or three years, which have been years of considerable stress in the western provinces, the rates have increased. The rate of 9 per cent is very common; 10 per cent is by no means uncommon, and I am sure that hon. members from the western provinces can give many instances in which 12 per cent has been charged. There can be no question, therefore, that excessive interest charges are made in that part of the country to-day. It may be that eastern Canada is more or less indifferent as to this particular interest rate section. I readily appreciate that an easterner will not understand the situation, when he is called upon to pay only the maximum rate fixed by the act, or perhaps even less. But I suggest to the committee that in the West the burden of an excessive interest rate has been felt very heavily for many years. I am sure the committee will not tolerate a condition under which the West feels that it is suffering unduly through an economic exploitation, in this regard and in regard to other matters as well—an exploitation which seems to work in favour of the East alone. What is needed is an effective interest section in the Bank Act, a pro-

vision that will mean something to the borrower, a provision that will be a real safeguard to him and that will not allow the banks to exploit him at their pleasure. It is with that purpose in mind that I propose to move an amendment to this section. When in committee I moved an amendment somewhat more drastic in its character. I have tempered the amendment to some extent, and I trust that the members of this committee may give it favourable consideration. I do not propose to deal with subsection 2. The amendment which I propose and now move reads as follows:

That subsection 1 of section 91 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The bank may stipulate for, take, reserve, or exact any rate of interest or discount but not exceeding 7 per cent per annum and may receive and take in advance any such rate.

(2) The rate of interest or discount charged by the bank shall appear on the face of the note, bill or other evidence of debt.

(3) In the event that a greater rate than 7 per cent per annum has been paid to the bank, then the person by whom it has been paid or his legal representative, may recover in any court the excess interest thus paid, provided such action is commenced within two years from the time such excess interest was paid.

(4) In any suit, action or other proceeding concerning a bank loan wherein it is alleged that the amount of interest paid or claimed exceeds the rate of seven per centum per annum, the court may reopen the transaction and take an account between the parties, and may, notwithstanding any statement or settlement of account, or any contract purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, reopen any account already taken between the parties, and relieve the person under obligation to pay from payment of any sum in excess of the legal rate of interest and if any such excess has been paid, or allowed in account, by the debtor, may order the bank to repay it, and may set aside either wholly or in part, or revise, or alter, any security given in respect of the transaction.

I would point out that the amendment does not affect subsection 2 of section 91 at all. In other words I have endeavoured to draft a clause which I firmly believe is an effective controlling clause as far as the maximum interest rate is concerned. I have endeavoured to give to the borrower who has been charged an excessive rate of interest the right of action to recover back the excess charge, and I have also sought to give the court power in the event of a transaction being reopened to revise the transaction and adjust the rate of interest, at the legal rate which is five per cent per annum.

Mr. LADNER: May I ask the hon. member, apart from the political aspect of such a proposal, does he think that on sound economic grounds it is practicable to fix a maximum rate of interest on capital or money in the banks and leave the rate of interest on all other forms of money entirely unlimited?

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend is not altogether right when he suggests that all other obligations are left unrestricted so far as the rate of interest is concerned. I have already indicated to the committee that restrictions will be found in the Interest Act, in the Pawnbrokers' Act and in the Money Lenders' Act.

Mr. LADNER: But those only apply to amounts of two or five hundred dollars and the like. That is to stop the sixty percenters. That is not in the ordinary course of business.

Mr. SHAW: I am not so sure that it is not done so frequently in the ordinary course of business. The legal rate of interest is fixed in the Interest Act, and that is a matter we are concerned with every day. As I say, Mr. Chairman, my object is to present to the committee an effective interest section. I am not wedded to the rate mentioned in the amendment, and if any reasonable argument can be advanced why that should be increased by a very moderate amount not over one per cent, I would be quite prepared after some consideration perhaps to agree to such an increase if the argument warranted it. But I think we should either have an effective section or no section at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who moves the amendment that this is a very important section. It was the occasion of a great deal of discussion and comment in the Banking committee, and I have no doubt that it is usually the subject of a great deal of discussion in the western provinces, where the discount rate is higher than it is in the East. That is not an unusual thing because in new countries the interest rate is always higher than in older countries. You go to the western states and you will find there a very much higher rate of interest than you do in the eastern states. You will also find in the American states that as they grow older and become more settled, as they advance in mixed farming and mixed products the rate of interest gradually falls. That, of course, is due to the fact that as the settlements become older there is an increase in accumulated wealth.

I agree also with the hon. member that the section is not in a very satisfactory state. Personally I do not like to see stated in a section that a given rate of interest shall be recovered, and yet it is possible for the banks by a system of discount, quite lawful, how-

ever, to recover a greater rate of interest than that stated which may be recovered at law. However, a problem was confronting the legislators of the day who framed that section, and I suppose it represents the best that could be done at the time. Personally I think it would be better and sounder if there was no reference at all to the rate of interest in the Bank Act. After all money is much like everything else. It should carry its market value. If in 1919 the Canadian banks in the East had raised the rate of interest to eight or nine or ten or fifteen per cent at a certain time, we would have escaped a great deal of the deflation that occurred and would have avoided the effects of the deflation from which we afterwards suffered. The American banks have been criticized by the most eminent bankers and economists of that country for not increasing their rate of interest in 1919. The American Federal Reserve Bank in 1919 was charging only 4½ per cent instead of charging 6 per cent and over, and had that higher rate been charged the United States would not have suffered from the great deflation which afterwards occurred, much to their detriment. The same thing occurred here. The leading economists of the world say that the best way to control the level of prices is to put up the interest rate when inflation is on and prices are rising, and to reduce it when the reverse is the condition. I believe that is sound doctrine. I could quote to the committee this evening, if time permitted, a statement from, I think, the most eminent economist of the world to-day who, writing upon the control of price levels, says that the only practical way of doing it is by putting up or lowering the interest rate.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask the name of the economist referred to?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Gustave Cassel, of Sweden. However, I am not going to propose that the clause in question be struck out; it would be very much resented, I suppose, by a very large section of the committee. The section in its present state is not perhaps quite acceptable to me; at least I do not care to see the provisions of the law stated in that way. However, it is perhaps better that there be some reference to the rate of interest which banks may charge.

The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) says there is no competition in banking. I say that statement is not correct. In money there is greater competition than anything in the world because there is absolute free trade in it. Millions of dollars come to Canada from the United States every year. In normal times millions of dollars come from Great Britain. Money can flow into this country without any legal impediment, without any tax whatever; and if there is one thing in the world that is absolutely free from monopoly it is money.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friends laugh but I venture to say they cannot contradict that statement.

Mr. IRVINE: I think so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member for Calgary West compares money with a railway, and he says the railway is a monopoly. Well, the railway is a monopoly. It always was, because it has not been the custom of the country to let people build railways anywhere and as they liked. The public must be protected. Therefore before any corporation can construct a railway they must receive permission in the form of a statute from the state. There is a monopoly in that, but I say again there is no monopoly in money, there is no semblance of it.

Mr. hon. friend (Mr. Shaw) seeks to affirm that there is a monopoly in banking because the rate of interest is the same in specified areas. That is true. Take the British market, the freest money market in the world. The rate all over England is the same any one day in the week, and that rate is effective among forty-five millions of people. The rate in Paris is the rate all over France on any given day. The rate in New York is probably the rate in the eastern sections of the United States for commercial loans. The Chicago rate may be the effective rate in the middle western states, or in a certain area, and on the other hand Seattle, Portland, and San Francisco may fix the current rate on the Pacific. The rate in the West, of course, is higher than it is in the East, and I suppose there is a reason for it. I suppose there is a reason for the city of Calgary to-day, by authority of a statute of the province of Alberta, charging interest on overdue taxes to the extent of two-thirds of one per cent compounded monthly. I do not know what that amounts to, but that is what they do in the very city from which my hon. friend comes, and by authority of the legislature of Alberta.

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend will realize that is not an interest rate, that is a penalty.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, penalty rates are always well within interest rates.

Mr. SHAW: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is no use exacting penalty rates which will take the property away from the taxpayer.

Mr. FORKE: That is what is happening right along.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In the West to-day the rates on private loans, as between individuals, are, I am told, far in excess of the rates charged in the East as between private individuals. I venture to say that if any of the hon. members from Alberta across the way were money lenders in that province they would exact 8, 9 and 10 per cent, and once in a while for very proper reasons would exact probably 10 or 12 per cent. Mortgage corporations charge a higher interest rate in Alberta and Saskatchewan than they do in the eastern provinces. I need not argue the reasons for that, they are very obvious. As I said before in new districts where there are no accumulations of wealth, where investment capital must come from a distance, higher rates of interest will be charged. Now, there was before the committee on Banking and Commerce—

Mr. IRVINE: If, as my hon. friend suggests, money flows freely from one country to the other, or from one province to another, wherever the market for the money is good, how does it happen that it never flows sufficiently into the money market to equalize the interest rates between the East and the West? How does it happen that the interest rates in the western and middle states in the United States are always higher than they are in the eastern states if money flows freely? Will my hon. friend kindly explain that?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Money flows from Canada into the United States almost daily because there are attractive investments there. The interest rate is better than they can secure in the investment market in Canada, and the security is satisfactory to the investor. The reason why the rates are higher in the middle and western states and in western Canada is because the security offered for investment is not so satisfactory to lenders or to investors. There is no class of securities that can be quickly cashed, there is no market in which they can be sold daily, and that is the reason why investment rates are usually higher in the West than in the East.

Mr. IRVINE: In that case Mr. Cassel and the hon. gentleman had better remove their argument from interest to security.

An hon. MEMBER: One governs the other.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I shall be quite content to stand by any opinion that Mr. Cassel expresses in preference to any view enunciated by my hon. friend.

Mr. IRVINE: May I interject here that I agree with the hon. gentleman in that regard, and I would much rather have the opinion of Mr. Cassel than that of my hon. friend.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I admit that is a very fair statement, and I am so modest that I would have made it myself without being encouraged to do so by my hon. friend. The interest rate in the West is, after all, a practical question. Reference was made to-day to the Weyburn Security Bank, a bank operating in the province of Saskatchewan, with seventeen agencies. The general manager of that bank is Mr. Powell. He appeared before the committee on Banking and Commerce and was asked as to what would be the effect if the bank interest rate was fixed at 7 per cent, and I want to read that portion of his evidence. The question was put to him by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens):

> I would like to ask you three or four questions as to matters which are in the bill now or on notice of motion. From your experience in the West, what would be the effect upon your business as a banker if the rate of interest was fixed by law at say 7 per cent?
>
> A. We would go out of business.

Now, I say to this committee: The manager of the Weyburn Security Bank is a practical man, an experienced banker, and I should say an honourable gentleman, and I do not think he would make that statement if he did not honestly believe it, and did not feel confident the actual situation justified the answer made. The same question was put to—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I interrupt to ask the hon. gentleman a question on that point? The hon. member ascribes to the manager of the Weyburn Security Bank certain attributes which I think are warrantable. Would he not ascribe similar attributes to those who presented the case for the western farmer? If he would, does it not then amount to a question as to whether agriculture is to be catered to, or the banks' interests are to be considered?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not quite apprehend the purport of the hon. member's question. Who particularly presented the case of the farmers before the committee apart from the members of the committee?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I failed to observe any desire on the part of the members

of the committee from the western provinces to indicate by argument or by the presentation of facts, anything which would go to show that the banks could do business in western Canada under 7 per cent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member misunderstands me. We did not attempt to prove that the banks could do business under 7 per cent in western Canada. We did state, however, that under present conditions agriculture could not continue to exist in western Canada at 8 per cent and over. That is the point.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Hon. members talk about interest rates being 9 and 10 per cent in the West. I want to point out that the evidence before the committee was to the effect that these rates did not generally prevail. Many loans are raised at 6, 7 and 8 per cent.

Mr. COOTE: Did Mr. Powell state what the average rate of interest charged by the bank was?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think he did. He said that the average interest rate was about 9 per cent. That is what he said. Sir John Aird, the general manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, was also questioned upon this particular point. Probably there is no bank in Canada that has had so wide and extended an experience in the loaning of money in western provinces as has the Canadian Bank of Commerce. This question was put to Sir John Aird by the hon member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael):

Q. That is a point I wish to get at. If the interest rate were kept strictly at seven per cent or below, you think your dividends would have to decrease to three per cent?—A. We would withdraw from a great many places in the West; we could not make money, because our margin of profit on small branches is very narrow, and being cut narrower every day by the action of provincial governments in introducing iniquitous legislation granting exemptions. I think they are realizing that now and that some of this iniquitous legislation is being repealed. I know of cases where first mortgages held by companies in the East have been wiped out by some of that iniquitous legislation. Again the governments are going into competition with us in opening banks. They pay a higher rate for deposits than we do. Well, we cannot do business if the provincial governments take our deposits. We either have to let them go or pay a higher rate.

In another portion of his testimony he gave reasons as to why the cost of doing business was higher in the western provinces than in the East. It is very easy to say that the West is over banked and that a great many of the existing institutions in that part of the country should be closed. But that was not the story ten or fifteen years ago and I do not know how you could very well eliminate those banks; it could not be done very well by process of law. I have no doubt that many of the banking agencies in the West will be closed particularly in Alberta, and possibly in Saskatchewan, from now on. I doubt very much, however, whether that will be satisfactory to the people of the West. Let me say again that it is not a correct statement of the condition of affairs to say that there is no competition among the banks. The competition is not determined by the question as to whether or not the rate is uniform throughout a large area, or whether it is the same throughout a very large country at a given time. I should think it would be a quite serious matter for many sections of western Canada if these banking agencies were closed. They perform a public service and are of great convenience to the communities which they serve. I for one, at any rate, am not going to assume the responsibility of altering the section. I think we should consider very carefully the wisdom of changing the section to fix a rate of interest at 7 per cent. That would be a very unwise course to adopt, and I trust the committee will decide that it is not advisable to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHAW: Is the hon. member prepared to wipe out the section altogether?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not speaking for the government. So far as I am concerned I think it would be a good way to have the law in reference to interest, but I fear it would meet with opposition from hon. members from the western provinces and I should not like to take the responsibility of saying it should be done.

Mr. LADNER: I do not think that hon. members in this part of the House can be accused of monopolizing the discussion of the bill now before the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LADNER: I am glad that the culprits concede that much. This is an exceedingly important section and to my mind it is an economic absurdity to provide in the Bank Act anything that purports to fix the rate of interest when it does not fix it. That is more than foolish. This question was thoroughly considered in the committee when arguments pro and con were advanced, and the committee finally disposed of it by making some additions with respect to the question of discounts. As a matter of fact, I submit, it is impossible to fix the rate of interest on money or capital which is invested in a bank or used by a bank for advances to the com-

munity, if you leave unlimited or unrestricted the rates of interest on all other forms of capital invested throughout the entire world. Money as it is represented in capital or in bonds and credit instruments, in bills or exchange and acceptances, is nothing more or less than a commodity, and in every money market in the world this commodity is given for exchange. It is bargained for, it is sold and purchased, and the rate of interest is adjusted accordingly. So that if, according to the arguments of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), the rate of interest in connection with money in the banks were fixed at seven per cent, there would be no reason for the shareholders or other people to retain their money in that form of investment. After all we must consider the question from the point of view of the general public and not of any particular section, and if the rate were fixed at seven per cent, then the shareholders might as well invest their money in any other form or take it to foreign countries where the rate of interest would be higher. I cannot conceive how any hon. member can argue for a moment in support of such a theory.

Mr. MILLAR: Will the hon. member mention one of the countries where the interest is higher?

Mr. LADNER: It may be higher at times in the western states. Money is, in fact, something that is essentially international. When rates are attractive here, it flows across from the States to this side. When they are attractive on the other side, the money flows there. Likewise it may go to Europe, and the credit facilities of banking institutions will deliver money or money credit in almost any part of the world. Nothing is more capable of distribution in small and great quantities than money.

There is no doubt that portions of the western provinces have a grievance as regards interest rates. We saw produced in the committee that considered this question promissory notes bearing 10 to 12 per cent rates of interest, mainly because they were from remote districts. Some hon. members opposite say that there is substantially keen competition in the banking world. I think that is so. That is the case in some towns in the West. I know in the little town of Ladner, British Columbia, there are the Royal Bank, the Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Montreal, and I have it on the best of authority that only one of those banks is actually paying, but the competition to get business is keen in the extreme. The presence of so many branch banks has largely brought that about. I noticed the other day that, in 1890, we had 38 principal banks making returns to the government, with a total capital of some $60,000,000, and we had 402 branch banks. In 1900, we had 36 principal banks with a total capital of $67,000,000, and the number of branch banks had increased to 663. In 1910, we had 33 principal banks, with a total capital of $100,000,000 and the number of branches had increased to 2,368. In 1923, we have the number of principal banks reduced to 17, with a total capital of $125,000,000, but the number of branches has grown in the last thirteen years to 4,472. Every banker knows that these branches do not all pay. There is competition, but there is also the expense of maintaining those branches.

My main purpose in rising at this juncture of this question is to suggest to the members of the committee that the way to remedy the question of the rate of interest is not by non-economic principles, nor by legislation, but by the ordinary methods of demand and supply. I suggest to the committee that the remedying of this question will not take place in Canada, just as the remedying of a number of other questions cannot take place until we have in this country a federal reserve bank system. In the United States, Great Britain and, in fact, Spain and Italy, in all the principal commercial countries of the world, the federal reserve bank system is in existence. This is a centralized system. A bank of rediscount, in its practical operations in the United States, handles the question of high or unfair rates of interest in remote portions of the country by the system of open market operations. Let us say that in the remote district of Calgary, say an out-of-the-way place, the rate of interest is 25 per cent, and it is necessary to correct that situation. Under the open market operations such as we have in a federal reserve bank system, the board of the federal reserve bank, which has an obligation to the government, to the people at large, as well as an obligation to the banks and other financial institutions, immediately takes steps to place its own money in that area in competition with the money of the ordinary banks, in order to force the rate of interest down. Let us say, in order to carry out the illustrations of the 25 per cent rate of interest in Calgary, that a federal reserve bank through its board would first notify the banks that were charging those excessive rates that the rates were too high. If the banks did not see fit to correct those rates, the federal reserve board would take its own money, and through the agency

which it has established in Calgary, it would go into that city and say to the people: "You can come to us and borrow money for 6 per cent." How long are any other banks going to lend money for 25 per cent, 10 per cent, or 8 per cent, when a competing institution will lend money at 6 per cent? In other words a federal reserve banking institution will correct an injustice of that kind by the ordinary, sound, economic principle of supply and demand just as it will assist the industrial and commercial community at large in times of stress through facilities of rediscounting paper, and just as in times of elasticity it will correct an undue increase or boom by utilizing the money rates to raise the rates of discount. I wish to lay before the committee the advantages of a federal reserve bank so far as it pertains to and is able to remedy such a question as rates of interest. The Chairman has properly ruled that the discussion must be confined strictly to the clause under consideration, and I hope I have followed his ruling in my remarks.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I wish to make just a few remarks to voice my objection to subclause 1 of section 91 as it stands in this bill. I notice there has been an addition to subclause 1, which is really a beneficial addition. It reads:

> The rate of interest or discount charged by the bank shall appear on the face of the note.

That is one amendment that we were able to get through the committee. Out of the many amendments proposed, that was one of the very few that received favourable consideration. I am quite aware that this matter of interest rates was debated at great length in the committee, and of course we did not accomplish anything in regard to setting a maximum rate. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated in his remarks that the interest rate in the West is a practical question. He uttered a truism when he made that statement. It is a practical question. People in the West run up against real, hard, practical facts in the matter of interest rates, and it is not only those who are in financial difficulties who have to pay high and what we might call exorbitant rates of interest. A rural municipality in western Canada with assets of between three and four million dollars must pay 7 per cent, or 7½ per cent, or possibly 8 per cent interest. I think Mr. Powell, manager of the Weyburn Security Bank stated that they charged 8 per cent interest to rural municipalities. No person will discount the security offered by a rural municipality, and yet the rate charged by the Weyburn Security Bank is 8 per cent. In our western country an agriculturist must be in exceptionally good circumstances to get money at 8 per cent. The majority pay 9 per cent and a large number pay 10 per cent interest on the money they borrow. If the banks were paying out a correspondingly high rate of interest for the use of the deposits made with them, possibly there would not be the same objection to the high rate which they charge on loans, but we find they pay but 3 per cent for the large bulk of the money that they loan out at 7, 8, 9, or 10 per cent.

10 p.m.

I might here make an observation in regard to the Weyburn Security Bank. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated that if the interest rate were set at 7 per cent this bank would go out of business. Well, it is only fair to say that they pay 4 per cent on deposits; therefore a 7 per cent maximum rate would militate against this bank.

We find that the banks control something over two billion dollars of the people's money, for the use of which they pay 3 per cent. In our western country at least the banks turn that money over at a spread of 5 or 6 per cent and possibly more. Now, it has been argued in the special committee—I do not know to what effect—that if the banks were limited to 7 per cent they would go out of business. I do not believe it, Mr. Chairman; but I do believe that if they were limited to 7 per cent they would curtail some unnecessary expenses. In the town of Weyburn, Saskatchewan, with a population of 3,500 we have seven banks. That is altogether unnecessary. Two banks could handle the business there. In the small town of High River, Alberta, with a population of 1,200, we have five banks—another unnecessary expense. And I need not remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the banks do not do business in shacks or in the same class of buildings that the majority of agriculturists have to live in from whom the banks make their profit. I hope that is quite clear.

Now, it may be asked, have we any proof whether the banks could continue in business if the rate were set at a maximum of 7 per cent.

Mr. STEVENS: Before my hon. friend leaves that part of his remarks dealing with Weyburn, would he tell me how it is that the Weyburn Security Bank, which pays 4 per cent interest on deposits, or 1 per cent higher than any of the other banks pay, has not attracted the deposits which go into the other six banks, if there is no such thing as competition in the banking business?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I think the Weyburn Security Bank did get a large amount

of western money before they opened up a banking business, that is, when they carried on a mortgage business. At that time they paid 4 per cent on deposits. When they launched into the banking business they continued to pay the same rate of interest. Whether they will be able to continue to do so in competition with the other banks I am not prepared to say.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the spread between what the banks pay on deposits and what they realize on loans is to my mind exorbitant. I do not know whether it would be wise to set the maximum at 7 per cent throughout Canada, for the reason that in western Canada possibly the risks during the past years have been greater than in eastern Canada on account of crop conditions. But according to reports from the West at the present time, risks out there will be fewer in the future possibly than they have been in eastern Canada.

Looking across the Pacific to the island-continent of Australia, we have what to my mind is an ideal system for controlling bank rates of interest. There they have established a government banking system known as the Australian Commonwealth Bank. I stated in the special committee that the bank started without capital and has not issued any since. The statement was challenged and it was asserted that the bank did raise or levy a certain amount of capital. In the absence of any further information I am not prepared to admit or refute the statement. But the information I had was that the bank commenced business on deposits taken from the post office and from the people, and has been able to carry on business for ten years by paying from 3 to 4 per cent on deposits and charging a maximum of 6 per cent on loans. And in the decade it has made a profit of something over $18,000,000. Now, it seems to me that if we are not going to be able to set a maximum rate of interest in the Bank Act, we shall have to resort to other ways and means to regulate the bank rate, and I think one good way to effect this regulation is to set up a competitive system that will operate alongside of our present banking system, and so control its rates.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I assume my hon. friend was in the West about 1900. Was there any fall in the average interest rate, say, between 1900 and 1914?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am prepared to admit that when crops and prices are good and the people in general prosperous, interest rates are low; but when we run up against adverse conditions, as we have for the past few years, interest rates are high. That is, our financial institutions unduly penalize the country at a time when it is suffering from depression. They should not be permitted to do this.

I would be quite prepared to vote for the amendment, but I am not optimistic enough to hope that the committee is likely to accept it. It seems to me that we are just talking here for the sake of putting forth what we think, and that we hope to attain nothing in the way of any very drastic relief from our present banking system.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member really mean that?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I do.

Mr. MILLAR: Mr. Chairman, not having been a member of the Banking committee I have taken very little part in the discussion, nor do I intend to, but I want to make a few observations on interest rates—a subject that appeals to me very strongly. I notice that in the discussion remarks are frequently made to the effect that this committee sympathises with the difficulties the West is passing through at the present time and would like to give some relief. But unfortunately that sympathy seems to fall short of reaching the point where it might bring relief. In fact, it is rather a passive sympathy. I have listened to the discussion with a great deal of interest, and I may say at the outset that I believe we have a good banking system. Indeed, I am not in favour of upsetting those institutions which have served us well in the past and have weathered the years of trial successfully, without feeling absolutely certain that we have something better to put in their place. For myself, I am willing to go to the extent of supporting only those amendments to the Bank Act that would seem to be almost beyond doubt a benefit. With regard to the high rate charged in the West —the hon, senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) referred to that—I would point out that during the years when we had cheap land, virgin soil which could be conveniently and cheaply cultivated; when weeds were entirely absent and when the farmers, owing to the increase in the value of their land, were growing fairly wealthy without the crop—in those days it was quite natural that the banks and other institutions should charge high rates in the West, because the trade would stand it; and having secured these higher rates they are now very reluctant to give them up. I have thought this matter over carefully, and I have failed to see why in the West, where the security is certain—

in many cases being victory bonds; in many cases wealthy men borrowing small amounts —where, in fact the security was almost as good as the bank itself and the losses of the banks in interest were nil—I have failed to see why a bank in the West doing a good business could not profitably lend money at 7 per cent as they are doing in the East.

Let me make a comparison. Walking the streets of Ottawa I was struck by the great number of bank branches that we have here. One sees a branch of the Bank of Montreal on one corner; he walks a few blocks and sees another branch of the same bank, and so it is with the Bank of Nova Scotia, the Union Bank and others. If it is possible, at the rates of 6½ and 7 per cent charged here, for the banks to keep up so many branches within a few blocks of each other, built on land for which a very high price is paid, carried on at great expense, it seems to me that in the comparatively small institutions maintained in western Canada, where there is no loss year after year and where even over a considerable period of years the aggregate loss would be very slight—it seems to me that in those districts the banks could be made to pay at the same rate of interest charged in the East. I believe it is true that in many cases, as the bankers say, they have lost money in the West. Why is that so? They loaned too freely in the arid districts, where the risk was great. They made the same mistake in lending too freely that the farmer made, in many cases, of borrowing too freely. But there is just this difference: in the case of the banks they are assured against loss resulting from their bad judgment, resulting from their lending money where they should not have loaned it.

It was argued in the Banking committee and it has been argued in this committee—if it was not specifically stated, it was implied—that because of these losses the banks in the West should be allowed to charge higher rates of interest. In other words, those who are paying their debts are penalized in order to ensure the banks against the results of their bad judgment. The farmer who made the mistake of borrowing too much must carry his own burden, and he is asked also to carry the burden of the banks where they have used poor judgment in the lending of money. I am inclined to think that what Mr. Powell and others have said is partly true—that if the rates in the West were reduced to 7 per cent the banks would quit business. I say that is partly true. They would quit business in towns where there are twice as many banks as there should be; they would quit business in arid districts where the crop fails four and five years in succession. I would be sorry to see the people in those districts subjected to any hardship, but in some parts of the country it does seem to me there is necessity for a clean-up in this connection. The banks and the government cannot continue forever to carry the people in an arid district, and I see no reason why those who live in districts that are not arid should, because of the conditions in the arid districts, be penalized so far as the rate of interest is concerned. I think it is unfair and unjust.

Reference has been made to the charge of two-thirds of one per cent imposed after taxes become due. Let me point out that that is not a rate of interest; that is a penalty which is imposed in order to induce people to pay their taxes when they are due. In fact, in our own municipality higher than two-thirds of one per cent per month is charged; the rate is one per cent per month, yet we have not looked upon it as a rate of interest and it cannot fairly be so considered.

It has been suggested that the law of supply and demand should regulate the interest charge, and the hon. senior member for Halifax has pointed to the fact that so far as deposits are concerned there was competition in Weyburn, for instance, in the matter of interest rates. But that competition affects very few people; it gives no relief. It is the interest on money loaned that is the important thing. It is true that there is a great deal of competition in an effort to get the business, but that competition does not reach the rate of interest on borrowed money. The rate of interest charged by two or three banks in the same town will be exactly the same—that is, the rate they will charge for money loaned. What good would it do if in a town forty or fifty miles away from where the borrower lives some of the banks were charging a lower rate of interest? What relief would that give? I cannot go fifty miles away, present my credentials at a bank in that place, and borrow money. They would say, "Why do you not borrow at home?" The only bank from which I can borrow money is the bank that is close to me that knows my financial standing, that keeps track of my business.

It has been stated by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) that it is impossible, ridiculous—I think he used the word "absurd"—to think of controlling the rates of interest charged by the banks while you allow money lent by other institutions —I suppose he meant mortgage companies and other institutions of that character—to go untrammeled and uncontrolled. I admit that I have a doubt whether a reduction to

a rate of 7 per cent in the West might not be too great a cut, but I believe that a move in that direction might well be made. It is just possible that if the banks lent money at a lower rate of interest their competition would compel the loan companies and the private lenders also to lower their rates. Is it not just as reasonable to expect that that will be the effect as that such a change is impracticable? Is it not quite as reasonable to believe that the other concerns will be compelled to come to the 7 or 7½ per cent rate in order to meet the competition as to believe that it is impossible to control the rate of interest charged by the banks while no control is exercised over the rate charged by other institutions? Very few changes have been made in the Bank Act—I am sorry that more were not made—but I think the committee would be well advised to take this suggestion into their serious consideration. If it is thought that a reduction to 7 per cent is too great a cut, at least it could be made 7½. For my part, if it comes to a vote I would take the risk of voting for the 7 per cent. I know the conditions pretty well in the West, and I feel that while the banks would have to make some readjustments, while they would cease business in certain places and a little hardship might be caused, the change might not be such as to compel them to withdraw from business. I have no doubt that for the most part they would continue as they are, and I am sure that the benefit would very much more than compensate for the loss. It is difficult to get any great reform without some little loss, but I say that in this case the benefits would undoubtedly more than outweigh the loss.

There is a general tendency towards monopoly, and a general tendency so far as the government goes to control monopoly. Recently we had a report handed in by the commission that investigated the Great Lakes freight rates, and one of their recommendations was that a maximum price be set for the carrying of grain upon the Great Lakes. We have never done that in the past. They have in the United States in a partial way, but we have not in Canada. That is a step forward that we have not yet accepted, but I have not very much doubt that when that matter comes before this committee we shall take that step forward in regard to the rates on the Great Lakes, and I believe it will be a wise step. When we control the rates on the railways, and we are going further in that direction every day of necessity because we must do so to protect ourselves, why is it such a disastrous thing to take such a step in connection with our banks? Surely when we consider the accumulation of money in so few hands we must realize that our banks are becoming more and more monopolistic every day. I hope the committee will look upon this amendment quite seriously. While the Banking committee have thought, I believe, that too many theories have been presented before it and perhaps have been a little frightened lest too drastic changes should be made, I feel that perhaps the tendency will be to close the door too tight and prevent such reforms as would be in the interest of Canada as a whole. We all know that there have been strong objections to reforms from time immemorial, and it sometimes takes considerable discussion and a lot of educational work before the country can be brought to that stage where they are willing to try something new. As I have said before I am not sure that the risk is too great, and if it comes to a vote I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. JELLIFF: I do not wish to prolong this debate unnecessarily. I know this committee is tired and that perhaps this particular phase of the discussion has been carried on too long already, but this subject is one that particularly appeals to me from a practical standpoint. I do not look at it from a theoretical standpoint at all. I have in view when I consider this question of the interest rate, the practical needs of this country and its condition at the present day and hour.

I must confess, Mr. Chairman, to a very keen sense of disappointment in some ways over the outcome of the revision of this act and the form in which it has come before parliament at this time. I was in hopes when the act was referred to the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce, of which I was a member, when it was fully considered there, when all the conditions prevailing throughout this country were laid bare so fully and completely, and when it was reported back to this House that we would have had something more in the way of a detailed statement either from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance or from the chairman of the Banking committee setting forth in brief at least what had been covered in the investigations of that committee, what they had found as to the conditions of the country, together with some concrete suggestions as to how they were going to meet the situation in the West. I felt all through that hearing that these gentlemen had a large sympathy with and interest in the people of the West under prevailing conditions, and I repeat, I am somewhat disappointed that

they did not go into that phase of the question and have some suggestions to make when this act was reported back to this House.

In regard to this interest clause, I am heartily in sympathy with the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). I do not believe that this country in any part of it is in a condition to-day to pay a higher rate of interest than seven per cent. I know that in my part of the West we have piled up in the banks thousands upon thousands of dollars in notes and securities of farmers which are bearing very high rates of interest, eight, nine and ten per cent, and if those notes in the hands of the banks continue to accumulate at the rates of interest they are now bearing I do not see how our farmers are going to lift the load and get on their feet. The only practical thing that can be done by this act to help them is to reduce the interest rate, and even that will help to only a limited extent, but to my mind, Mr. Chairman, it is the one essential thing. It will open the road, it will implant a feeling of hope and confidence in the minds of the farmers of the West, and if there is anything that is needed above that in this country I hardly know how to express it.

The hon. Minister of Finance said to-day that we had in prospect a very good crop in the West. The reports to that effect I think are true. I have had similar reports, and of course a good crop will have some effect upon the situation, but I cannot see how it can carry us to any very great extent towards the liquidation of the debts that are upon that country. My feeling after carefully canvassing the matter is that not only one good crop will be needed to even help move that load, but seven or eight or nine or ten good crops will be required to accomplish the object which he is hopeful we shall attain. I wish I could be as hopeful of the situation as he is, and I am a man of hope myself. I appreciate the fact that he feels even a little encouragement over the present situation. But suppose this rate is reduced to seven per cent? Is the disaster to the banking institutions of this country that has been apprehended going to occur? I do not believe it. I believe on the other hand it will result in good to the banks.

I believe that the banks need to have faith and confidence in our great West to a greater extent to-day than even the farmers. I came from the state of Illinois. In that state, from the days of my birth, they have had a maximum rate of interest of 7 per cent. Did that rate of interest ever injure the state of Illinois? Did it ever wreck its banking system, its great commercial institutions or its great factories? But in the last sixty years Illinois has risen from a young state to one of the greatest states in the whole world. Her manufacturing institutions alone turn out each year three billion dollars worth of manufactured goods; more than does the entire Dominion of Canada. Within the last sixty years of the existence of the live stock markets in Chicago over 750 million animals have passed through that market. The Chicago grain market is also one of the great grain markets of the world. Is there any evidence to show that the limitation of the rate of interest to 7 per cent has done any harm there? Can you point to an instance where there has been greater general development, or greater improvement in the welfare of the people?

The same is true of a number of other states. The state of Michigan has had a maximum rate of 7 per cent for a great many years, and it is to-day one of the greatest states in the Union. One of its cities alone has produced a manufacturer who has made greater use of his wealth than possibly any other individual on the American continent to-day. In the state of New York the same beneficial results have been witnessed. There they have had an even lower maximum rate for their general loans, 6 per cent, for many years; and in many other states a low maximum rate of interest has been the rule. Has that low rate of interest ruined those states? Has it injured the state of New York? Do we not go to New York when we want to get the millions that are sometimes necessary to tide us over our own difficulties here? I cannot help but conclude when I look this situation squarely in the face, that neither our banks, nor our financial institutions of any kind, nor any class of our people, have the least reason to fear the fixing of the maximum rate of interest at 7 per cent.

I know what it means to the men out on the farm if we continue the existing rate; if they have to go up against the burden of accumulated indebtedness in our banks at existing rates. It will mean the continual and further crowding down on the perspiring brow of the husbandman of this country a crown of thorns; the man who, by his industry, is producing year after year not only the food for his own family but for the families of those engaged in other occupations, and for the hungry and needy across the seas; the man by whose industry a new stream of golden wealth is produced each year to vitalize and keep up our transportation systems, and to bring strength and prosperity into all the avenues of our commercial and in-

dustrial life. We must take these things into consideration. We must do all we can, when revising this Bank Act, to bring needed relief to our people. They are looking for that relief and they will be disappointed if they do not get it. I picked up and put into my pocket this evening a little volume from which I desire to read a brief extract. It is from the speech which a great American, Abraham Lincoln, whom the world has always loved and admired, made on the subject of slavery —I will merely read this fragment from the speech:

> Free labour has the inspiration of hope; pure slavery has no hope. The power of hope upon human exertion and happiness is wonderful. The slave-master himself has a conception of it, and hence the system of tasks among slaves. The slave whom you cannot drive with the lash to break seventy-five pounds of hemp in a day, if you will task him to break a hundred, and promise him pay for all he does over, he will break you a hundred and fifty. You have substituted hope for the rod. And yet perhaps it does not occur to you that to the extent of your gain in the case, you have given up the slave system and adopted the free system of labour.

That is what I believe we should all do at this time in regard to our country if we have in mind its future development. Implant hope and confidence in our people and with it will come prosperity and happiness. Let us do this much in the way of limiting this burden; restrict this interest rate to seven per cent, help the people out of this difficulty, and throw light upon their future pathway. I do hope, Mr. Chairman, this amendment will be accepted.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not desire to delay the House at any great length, but I wish to put myself on record as being in favour of the amendment now being considered. We have at present in the Bank Act a clause which pretends to make the maximum rate of interest 7 per cent, but it has never been effective. I think, in view of the evidence that has been adduced this session before different committees of the House, we cannot help but believe that the banks can do business on a 7 per cent rate of interest. We have the evidence of different rural credit associations in Canada who are doing business on a spread of one per cent in interest between what their money cost them and the rate at which they loan it, and they are making surpluses on that margin of one per cent. At the same time we have banks, or bankers coming before different committees of the House and plainly stating that they cannot do business on a spread of less than 5 and 6 per cent. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the present banking system is as efficient as our leading bankers would lead us to believe, why is it that they cannot do business as cheaply as amateur organizations, as you might call the rural credit associations of Canada? Because, when these rural credit associations were first started it was said by the banks and the bankers that they could not function at that cheap rate of interest, they could not carry on their business on a spread of one per cent, but they have proved conclusively that this is possible.

There is another feature that would look to be in favour of the banks. The turnover of the rural credit associations is slow, it is on long terms; the turnover is once in thirty years. If they can do business on a turnover of one per cent, it does not look logical to me that the banks cannot do business on a spread of less than 5 and 6 per cent on their turnover, especially when they turn their capital over several times during the year.

As I said, I do not wish to detain the committee, but these are some of the thoughts that have occurred to me. It has been said that if the maximum rate of interest is made low, and the banks are compelled to live up to it, that a good number of the branch banks in the West will cease to do business. Personally, Mr. Chairman, from the information I have, I think it would be a good thing for the country if some of the branch banks did cease to do business in some of the towns, not only in western Canada but in eastern Canada. We have the spectacle of three or four branch banks in a town, surrounded possibly, by a good farming community where there is only about business enough for one branch bank. We thus have two, or three, or four branch banks competing for the business, which means that the people who patronize these banks must pay the overhead expense of four banks when there should only be one. I think the fact that there are too many branch banks is one of the reasons why the banks have been charging a rate of interest that is not justified by actual practice in other lines.

There is another feature which was very well brought out in the committee investigations this session, and that is the fact that agriculturists pay a higher rate of interest than people engaged in any other industry in Canada, and also higher than those in any other country one might mention. Nearly every other country has an extended rural credit scheme whereby the farmer can get cheap capital; and I hope that the government will see fit to institute in the very near future, some form of rural credits financed federally. The report submitted today by the special committee on agriculture

will, I presume, be under discussion later on when I shall have something to say in this connection. I quite realize that anything I might say on the question now would be out of order. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but I must go on record as being in favour of the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: I, too, want to go on record on this subject, and I want at the same time to deal with two matters referred to by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). Speaking with regard to a certain economist, that hon. gentleman said that in practice there was such a thing as putting the rate up under certain conditions, while it came down on other occasions. So far as we are concerned, I want to say that we have never known the rate to come down; it has always gone up in the West. Another thing that seemed rather peculiar to me was the fact that while the hon. member would have the banks charge seven per cent, he would also allow them to charge a much greater rate; and we have it on record that the average rate in the case of the Weyburn Security Bank is 9 per cent. The hon. member for Halifax quoted the manager of the Weyburn Security Bank and observed that we all considered him honest in his statements. The question is, however, did he submit any facts? Did he produce his books to show that his institution could not continue in business on a seven per cent basis? It was simply a matter of evidence, and before a man makes a statement of that kind he should be able to back it up with facts. This gentleman should have been able to prove that his bank would go out of business under different circumstances. We have it on the authority of western members that many of the farmers are going out of existence because a higher rate than seven per cent is being charged. The senior member for Halifax said that there was competition among the banks. Well, if there is I have not had the pleasure of seeing very much of it. I believe there is competition in the United States because the banks are very easily multiplied there. But it is difficult to multiply the banking institutions in this country. The trouble is that on the contrary, they are reduced in number here until to-day they have a monopoly of the credit situation in Canada.

The hon. member continually referred to the issuance on the part of the banks as money. I do not altogether agree with that. It is a matter of credit; and Siegel of the United States says, in regard to interest, that the credit of a bank is valuable only when it can be changed for real money. We have not the gold standard in Canada, and I do not think you could go to an ordinary bank to-day and get real money for the credit they offer you. Yet, notwithstanding that they are privileged to extend credit, they are given the further privilege of monopolizing the interest rate. I for one protest against this; and I say that if the government make regulations in regard to banking in this country they ought to have the same authority in the matter of rates and should be able to stipulate what should be the legal rate for the banks in the West to charge the farmers who borrow money from them.

The hon. member for Halifax also declared that as we became an older country and entered a little more extensively into mixed farming the time would come when we should have a cheaper rate, as in the East. By that time, however, many of us will be under the sod. No; what we want is something that will help us in our present situation. We are not looking so much to the future; we are very much concerned about what can be done to remedy the evils that exist under present circumstances. Now that there is deflation in the West and conditions are not optimistic, it does seem to me that the present time is most opportune to lower the rate, as suggested; and for that reason I am heartily in support of the proposed amendment. I believe it is quite within the authority of parliament to enact that 7 or 7½ per cent shall be the maximum rate legally chargeable by any bank which is given a charter by federal legislation.

Mr. IRVINE: The only hon. member on the government side of the House who has spoken against the amendment is the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). It is rather unfortunate that we should find it necessary to bombard one hon. member all the time, but as he has avowed himself the protagonist of the Bank Act and—shall I say?—the apologist of the bankers in this regard, there is nothing left for us but to deal with the arguments he has presented to the committee. In opposing the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) the hon. member for Halifax said that money was much like anything else; and upon that basis he proceeded to build up an argument. Now, as a matter of fact, money is in no respect like anything else, and that is where the hon. member erred. On that false hypothesis he argued that interest could not be fixed because money flows to points where the highest rates are

paid. In other words, he placed money on the basis of ordinary commodities which rise and fall with the demand. If this were absolutely true, money would flow to the highest interest point in such volume as to reduce the rate of interest to the lowest possible minimum. That is what happens in the case of potatoes or in the case of clothing: the commodity flows in such quantities to the place of greatest demand,—which is naturally the place where the highest price is offered—but as the demand is satisfied there ensues a reaction. The price drops, and the commodity must find some other outlet. This is not true in regard to money. In order to refute the theory used as argument one may refer to the hon. member's own statements. He showed that the rate of interest in New York was different from that in Chicago or in the western states of the American union. It is true in Canada that the interest rates are low in the East as compared with the West. If money flowed, as the hon. member says, to the point where interest rates are highest, it should flow in such volume that in western Canada one would find it at reduced rates of interest, in a short time and ultimately at the minimum. But as the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) has pointed out, we have no experience of any falling of rates in the West. The only thing we know about them is that they are climbing up.

Take the case of Great Britain as compared with Canada. Money is a free trade commodity, and it flows from one country to another declares the hon. member for Halifax. Now this is clearly not true. Interest rates in Great Britain are much lower than they are in Canada. Therefore, if his argument were sound, money ought to flow from Great Britain into Canada just like the Gulf stream going the opposite way, and ultimately we would have as low and even a lower rate of interest at times in Canada than they have in Great Britain. But that is not so. There must be something wrong then with the basis of the hon. gentleman's argument. While he accepted this principle, it seems to me that he departed from it before he finished with his argument, because he said in reply to a question which I put to him in this connection, that this flow did not continue in a volume sufficient to reduce the rate of interest to western Canada because the security was not good. This argument then must be applied to Canada as a whole in relation to Great Britain which is to say that Canadian security is not good enough to attract money from Great Britain. But that this form of reasoning means that my hon. friend either does not think the rate of interest is the important thing or else that he is confused in his thinking, for he virtually abandons his first contention and says now that the security for money, not the rate of interest, is the important thing. Therefore, it is the security of the investment, more than interest rates, that guides the price level. If that is so, then the whole argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) falls to the ground, and it cannot be applied to the present debate.

He also referred to the statement of Professor Gustav Cassel to the effect that price levels are controlled by interest charges. But after accepting this, the hon. member for Halifax proved that securities controlled interest, and therefore securities must control price levels. Therefore, he is not in agreement with Professor Cassel as he declared himself to be; he is in opposition to him. But let me for the moment accept the statement of Professor Cassel, although I have no more reverence for that professor than I have for a hundred others, and simply because he says it, is not a conclusive argument to my mind that it is so. I am prepared to admit, for the sake of argument, that there is something in the statement of the professor, namely, that the rate of interest may have some relation to prices. Even so, it can still continue, for the proposal of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) fixes only the maximum rate of interest. There is a great range from 7 per cent to 1 per cent; that leaves plenty of room for the affecting of price levels. So even accepting the statement of Professor Cassel as being sound economics, we still may utilize the truth of that after having passed the amendment which has been moved.

I am not prepared to admit that the rate of interest is even an important factor in fixing prices. Let me give you a parallel to this. It used to be believed that profits were regulated by the prices charged for goods, and those who handled goods naturally supposed that the higher the price they charged the more profit they would make. But after a while they found that turnover was more important than high prices; they found that if they could cut their prices just a little above the cost of production and overhead, they could double or redouble their sales, and they could make more money than by charging high prices. That is just as true when you apply it to money, since money is used as a commodity, as it would be in the case of any other commodity in the market. If you cut

the price of money by reducing interest charges, you have immediately the effect of increasing the loans, and by increasing the loans that are made, you increase the business that will be done by the banks. There is no loss; in fact, there might be an increase of the interest charges on the whole, and thus the price levels would still be affected in a similar fashion providing of course that interest rates do affect prices.

But the chief point to be considered in this argument is that while the hon. member for Halifax argues strenuously that interest rates cannot be fixed, and I think the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Ladner) said that the proposal was an economic absurdity, yet against all these the fact remains that interest rates are fixed in Canada to-day. They are fixed in Great Britain; they are fixed in New York, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman for Halifax. If they are fixed by the banks, why cannot they be fixed by this government in the interest of the people? If these hon. gentlemen are to be logical in their argument, they must face their own logic. After proving to us in one part of the argument that interest rates could not be fixed at all, they quietly tell us that interest rates are fixed now; that they are the same throughout Great Britain at any one given time; that they are the same in New York; that they are the same in eastern Canada. If they are fixed already by the Bankers' Association of this country, by the financial associations of other countries, they are fixed by them in their own interest.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): When I said that the market rates for money were fixed at certain centres, I did not say that they were fixed by bankers or by law. I meant that they were fixed by market conditions.

Mr. IRVINE: As a matter of fact, they are not fixed by market conditions, as I have shown to hon. members, because in that case we would have the same rate of interest all over this country, or at least the rates would be at some time lower in the West than in the East, caused by the flow of money to the highest market, but this never happens. The rate of interest in this country is fixed by the Bankers' Association. Therefore, the very point that is characterized by an hon. member as an economic absurdity is now in practice in Canada, and the very point which the hon. member for Halifax says would, perhaps, result in the destruction of the banking system, although he did not say that in those terms, is already in practice in Canada. The point is, if the Bankers' Association, having a virtual monopoly in this country, has already fixed interest charges both east and west, fixed them on the loans they make, on the deposits they take from the people, fixed them in their interest in order to make profits for the bank, it is highly desirable and practicable that this committee and this parliament should fix the rate of interest so as to take care of the well-being of the people.

11 p.m.

Let me say that I would be in favour of no restriction whatsoever if the banks did not have a monopoly. Break up your monopoly, and we do not need any such restrictions. Ordinarily we should have a clean-cut competition in banking, and if that were so interest rates would depend upon the amount of money available for loans. But in a country where there are seventeen banks meeting in one association, fixing interest rates in each community at the same rate in every bank, then as regards interest rates we have a monopoly, and the only possible protection that the people have against such a monopoly is such a restriction as is proposed in the amendment under consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Many hon. gentlemen in this House to our right and on the treasury benches seem to take it for granted that the only problems in western Canada are those of poor crops and they refer repeatedly to the drouth districts in the south and southwest. I live in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan where we always have good crops, where in twenty years we have not had an actual crop failure, where we have abundance of rain, where we have the best of soil —in a word, where nature has indeed been most kind to us. Yet we have problems so acute there that whole districts are being deserted. If you were to ask the average citizen there to-day as to what these problems were, he would in all probability summarize them under four heads: tariff, transportation rates, markets, interest. And if I were asked to put my finger on the most urgent need of the community and on its most vital problem I would say, without a moment's hesitation, interest. Hon. gentlemen who come from the old settled parts of the Dominion perhaps do not appreciate the difficulties in a newly settled country. Your farmers as I know them in the Maritime provinces, and to a lesser extent in Ontario, are in a great many cases either on inherited farms or farms that they paid for years ago, so that the interest problem does not enter into their production costs at all. But in a new country it is generally the poorer classes of men who come to carve out a home in the wilderness, and interest with them is a

very vital problem. Indeed, I think there is nothing that would put western Canada more quickly on the map to-day than a reduction in the rate of interest. Our hon. friends on the government benches and on our right are boosting immigration, and some very hard things have been said against hon. gentlemen in this section of the House because we have pointed out the fallacy of any such policy at the present time. To hon. gentlemen to our right and to hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches I would say that if they are really sincere and want to attract immigrants, if they want to re-establish the farmers of Canada to-day, they can do this in no better way than by assisting us in securing a reduction of interest. The interest paid by the average farmer in the West to-day is crushing out his economic life and is driving tens of thousands off the land. I am not entirely clear in my own mind whether this question should be dealt with through the Bank Act or under a rural credit scheme. But if nothing can be done here—and I take it for granted that our friends are not seriously considering this amendment—then in all seriousness I say: If you are sincere and want to see people come into the country to help in its development and to share our financial burdens, then by all means assist us to get some form of rural credits that will cut the interest rates which are so burdensome on our western farmers to-day. Tens of thousands of these men are plodding along in such poor financial shape that they can see no possible chance of getting through. The rate of interest every year means to them more perhaps than the whole profit on their crop under the most favourable circumstances. But if some scheme can be devised for the reduction of the interest rate, and their indebtedness spread over a long period of years, I can assure hon. members opposite and on our right that they will no longer hear the bitter complaints from western Canada that they are hearing to-day, for they will have solved one of the greatest problems of the West. To our good protectionists—and I refer to my hon. friends on the treasury benches, because they are just as much protectionists as hon. members to our right—I say if you want to hear less about the tariff from us and to get us to accept it under protest, help us to reduce this interest rate. We will never be favourable to the tariff, but we will be prepared to accept it under protest, as well as a good many other things, for the sake of peace and harmony if you assist us in this one vital, urgent need of the western country to-day.

Amendment, (Mr. Shaw) negatived: Yeas, 38; Nays, 64.

On section 91, subsection 2—Return to minister.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this amendment has been defeated, but I think it is an amendment that is very necessary for—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COOTE. Mr. Chairman, am I in order or not?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The hon. member cannot reflect on a vote of the committee, if that is what he intends doing. Or does he intend moving another amendment. Subsection 2 is now before the committee.

Mr. COOTE: I want to speak to the motion, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to move another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): All right, that is in order.

Mr. COOTE: I want to bring to the attention of hon. members some figures that they may not be familiar with, showing the rate of interest that is being charged by the chartered banks of Canada to-day. This is from a return brought down by the government a few weeks ago. The first return shows a 90-day loan on an amount between $1,000 and $25,000, drawing 10 per cent interest. The same bank shows a loan of the same amount in another part of Canada at 8 per cent interest, and another in still another part of Canada at 5 per cent. The next return I have here shows that on an amount between $250 and $1,000 this bank is charging 12 per cent on a loan for a period of three months made in one part of Canada while at another of their offices they are charging on a loan of the same amount for the same length of time, 5 per cent. They also show that at three different branches the rate was 10 per cent while at another it was 12 per cent. The next return shows a charge on notes for three months of 12, 11 and 10 per cent at offices located in western Canada, and at three offices in eastern Canada, on loans of the same amount, a rate of 5 per cent.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend tell us what were the securities offered for these loans?

Mr. COOTE: I am sorry, but the return does not show the securities offered. I have no doubt that the security was all right, or they would not have made the loans.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: My hon. friend says that loans of the same amount were made in one part of Canada at 12 per cent and in another part of Canada at 5 per cent. Were these loans made under similar circumstances?

Mr. COOTE: They are shown under the same heading in the return. The return shows on the first line loans between $50 and $250; on the next line loans between $250 and $1,000; on the next line, loans between $1,000 and $25,000; on the next line, loans of $25,000 and over. The term of the loan is the same in most cases, or practically the same, and the amounts are the same. The next return shows the maximum rates of interest to be as follows: Three at 10 per cent; one at 8 per cent; and the minimum rates: Two at 5 per cent; two at 6 per cent. The next return shows that on loans of over $1,000 for three months a rate charged in a western office is 10 per cent while on the same amount in a town of eastern Canada its rate is 5 per cent. The next return shows a very fair comparative rate. It is 8 per cent in one case; the maximum rate in the next line is given at 7 per cent and the minimum as 6 per cent. I am glad to say that that is what we generally term a French bank. The next return shows loans running from 8 per cent down to 4½ per cent; all these loans are in Canada. It is shown that in Toronto they have money lent at 3 per cent, on overdraft. The next return shows loans ranging from 4 per cent in eastern Canada to 10 per cent in Manitoba. There is one item here which I hope the hon. member for Halifax will take note of: It is a loan of over $250 for a period of seven months, on which the rate of interest was 13 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Is my hon. friend giving the averages in each case, or only in special cases? The return shows the average.

Mr. COOTE: I shall be glad to give the averages too. The maximum rate is 13 per cent as shown in the return.

Mr. FIELDING: And the average?

Mr. COOTE: The average is 7.18.

Mr. FIELDING: That is not so bad.

Mr. COOTE: The minimum rate is 5 per cent.

Mr. VIEN: May I ask whether the interest rates are given according to the territory in which the loan was made?

Mr. COOTE: The one I just quoted was made at Three Hills, Alberta, and one of the same size was made at Winnipeg, at 5 per cent. There were three in eastern Canada at 5 per cent. I may say here that I would be quite satisfied if the committee would set the maximum rate of interest at the average rate shown by these returns.

The next bank shows an average rate earned of 7.06 per cent and it shows loans at all the way from 5 to 10 per cent. I may say that some higher rates are shown here, but they are on loans for very short periods, and I have tried not to cite the figures for any loan of that kind. In the next return I find that the rate on a loan between $1,000 and $25,000 for a period of one month was 10 per cent, while several loans of the same amount were made elsewhere at 5½ per cent. Now, these returns are pretty much alike, and I do not know that anything is to be gained by reading anything more from them. But I would like to give the average rate of interest shown in each of these returns. They are as follows: 7.27; 6.5; 7.39; 7.20; 7¼; 7.06; 7.18; 6.596; 6.20; 7.57; 6.69; 7.17; 7; 6.8; 7.44.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend admit that the rate of interest varies according to the territory in which the loan is made and also according to the security offered? For instance, the rate of interest will be much smaller against government guarantees than against personal security. In a territory where the cost of management is very high owing to the small volume of business transacted, the rate of interest increases. Does my hon. friend object to the rate varying according to the cost of management and to the kind of security offered?

Mr. COOTE: That question is too complicated for me; I cannot answer it all at once. But my hon. friend asks whether the rate varies according to the security offered. I would simply tell him that we have to pay eight per cent interest on a loan against a victory bond. I do not know what better security than that could be offered. I do not see why in western Canada I cannot borrow money against a victory bond at seven per cent if it can be borrowed in eastern Canada at six per cent.

Mr. DUFF: Sell the bonds.

Mr. COOTE: Well, I am afraid that next year the bank might change its mind and not give me any credit, and I would then have to have the bonds to fall back on to keep the wolf from the door. If the members of this committee absolutely refuse to limit the rate of interest charged I want them to do it with their eyes open. I have shown something of the rate of interest charged by these banks, and now I should like to give the dividends some of them are earning.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend say that it is a general rule out west to charge eight per cent on a note secured by victory bonds as collateral, that that is the common practice?

Mr. COOTE: To the best of my knowledge in the small branches at any rate in western Canada—I do not know anything about the larger ones—there is no money loaned on the security of victory bonds at anything less than eight per cent, and in addition to that you cannot usually borrow for more than three months. I do not know if they feel that the bond is liable to be no good at the end of three months or not.

I have here a little circular put out by Aemilius Jarvis Company regarding bank stocks and recommending the purchase of these stocks as a good investment. The first bank which appears on this circular is the Bank of Nova Scotia. It shows profits amounting to $2,000,000 odd earned in 1922 after making provision for everything. During the seven year period from 1916 to 1922, its earnings averaged 20.49 per cent per annum on the capital stock. I should say in all fairness that this is the highest rate of dividend paid by any chartered bank. Dividends of 10 per cent per annum were paid from 1903 to 1905 inclusive.

Mr. FIELDING: And it has the highest reserve of any bank.

Mr. COOTE: The rate of dividend has steadily increased until now 16 per cent is being paid.

Mr. MARLER: Is the hon. member aware that the Bank of Nova Scotia has a larger reserve than its capital, and that the earning power of its capital represents also what its reserve earns? It means that as regards the whole capital and reserve the earning power is very likely to be not more than eight per cent. I think my hon. friend does not mean to be unfair.

Mr. COOTE: I do not wish to be unfair at all, but I would point out right here what a splendid opportunity there is for a bank in Canada that is managed properly when the Bank of Nova Scotia can show such a result. I think the Bank of Nova Scotia has been the best managed bank in Canada for a great many years. It just shows the possible earning power if the bank is properly managed.

Mr. MARLER: Is the hon. gentleman also aware that the Bank of Nova Scotia's reserve has been built up by sale of stock at a premium? I only throw out these suggestions.

Mr. COOTE: I will admit what the hon. member says. A part of its reserve is built up out of premiums on sale of stock, but the whole reserve was not built up from that. If the bank had not been making splendid earnings there would have been no premium on the stock. There is no reason why some of the other banks in Canada should not show just as good a record as the Bank of Nova Scotia, if they had been just a little more careful of the loans which they made. Just so that the members of the committee will not run away with the idea that that is the only bank in Canada making good profits I will take one or two others. Here are the figures for the Dominion Bank. I have not looked to see what earnings they made but I am satisfied that the dividends will be large enough. Dividends at the rate of 12 per cent per annum have been paid each year from 1906 to 1922 and a bonus of 2 per cent was paid in the years 1913 and 1914, and 1 per cent in 1920, 1921 and 1922. During the past seven years the earnings on the capital stock averaged 17.56 annually. For the current year a dividend of 12 per cent per annum was paid, with a bonus of 1 per cent.

Now I will give one of the small banks, a bank which some years ago I believe was on the point of being merged with one of our other banks, but the Finance Minister, quite wisely I think, prevented that amalgamation. I refer to the Bank of Hamilton. The last financial statement shows that for the twelve months ending February 28, 1922, the bank showed a net profit of $850,672. Its earnings for that year were at the rate of 17.01 per cent on the capital stock, while the earnings for the past ten years have been in excess of 17.30 per cent. The bank's dividend record shows 10 per cent per annum paid from 1905 to 1910 inclusive, 11 per cent per annum in 1911 and 1912, and 12 per cent per annum from 1913 to 1922 inclusive. The current dividend rate is 12 per cent per annum.

I will simply quote one more and that is the Royal, one of the large banks. Its earnings last year were equivalent to 16.95 per cent on the capital stock, while for the eight-year period from 1915 to 1922 its earnings averaged 18.80 per cent annually. At the present time the balance to the credit of profit and loss account is $1,007,514. The current rate of dividend is 12 per cent per annum with a bonus of 2 per cent. I want to remark right here that the men in whose interests we are asking for a limitation of the rate of interest are not paying dividends on their business, neither dividends nor bonus. Furthermore, I would like to point out to the government particularly that they are spend-

ing something like $3,000,000 this year on an immigration policy, and the larger part of it is to be devoted to bringing farmers to this country. Most of these farmers will need a little banking accommodation, and I am sure that in the lands from which they come they have not been paying 13 per cent interest. When they want a little banking accommodation in this country and are asked to pay that rate there will be as much dissatisfaction among them as among the Hebrideans whose case we discussed in the House a few days ago.

There is one other thing I would like to mention as a justification for limiting the rate of interest charged by the banks, and that is that they have a very special privilege granted to them in being able to issue notes. That is a privilege which other corporations or private parties who may charge a higher rate of interest do not have and surely we have a right to expect some return from the banks for this very special privilege. The hon. member for Halifax referred to the statement of Mr. Powell of the Weyburn Security Bank that if the rate of interest were limited to 7 per cent they would go out of business. I want to say that a great many farmers in western Canada, I think the majority of them, would come to this House if they had the opportunity and tell hon. members that at the present prices they receive for their products and the present cost of production, if they have to pay more than 7 per cent they will go out of business. It may be a case of choosing whether you want banks or whether you want farmers in western Canada. I do not think the banks will produce anything that will furnish traffic for the railroads to enable them to earn the dividends of which we have heard so much, but the farmers, if they are considered in this matter, will produce something for these railroads to haul. I think in this House we should try to be fair to all parties.

The general manager of the Bank of Commerce, Sir John Aird, when he was before the Banking committee when this very subject was under discussion—I think that was the time—gave as one excuse for the high rates of interest which they charged in the West the high cost of doing business there. And one of the reasons which he gave for their high cost of operation was that they had opened branches in western Canada to provide positions for returned men. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to put this up to the members of the committee very squarely: Is it a fair proposition to place upon the producers in western Canada this task of furnishing positions for returned men? If the banks want to furnish positions for these returned men, and I think they should, they might do it in some other part of the country that can stand the expense better than western Canada can.

The banks in western Canada are charging this high rate of interest because of the mad rush of the banks there to establish branches. In the year 1919 there were approximately 900 branch banks opened in Canada. Does any hon. member of this committee think that the banks were justified in opening that number of new branches? I have not the figures here, and I am sorry that I have not, showing the increase in population in Canada in that year. I do not think it was very great, and I cannot for the life of me see that there was any good reason for the opening of 900 branches in the Dominion in that year. Why the banks should attempt to saddle on the people the result of their own—I think I may say—foolish action in this case is more than I can understand. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that if the majority of our Canadian banks had been as well managed as they should have been—as well managed for instance as the Bank of Nova Scotia—they would all be able to return a very handsome dividend if the maximum rate of interest they were allowed to charge had been 7 per cent.

Now, in connection with the expenses which the banks have in western Canada I want to show how they spend some of their money. I have here "A Farm News Letter" issued by the Canadian Bank of Commerce. It tells "How to grow sweet clover." "When to sow vegetables," "Managing a dairy herd," "Experience with Siberian alfalfa," and "Improved method of summer fallow." There is an article on "The Olds School of Agriculture" and another on "Why a bank charges commission when cashing an out-of-town cheque." It does seem to me rather a serious reflection on the Minister of Agriculture. Some may think the minister is not doing his duty, but I want to say right away that possibly the Bank of Commerce is in error. I think the Minister of Agriculture is keeping the people well supplied with these publications, and their issue by the Bank of Commerce is an error in judgment on the part of that institution. An hon. member suggests to me that possibly the minister and the Bank of Commerce have been in consultation. Well, perhaps so, co-operation is a fine thing; and if they are going to continue issuing these pamphlets they would do well to consult with each other so that there will not be needless duplication. To use an expression which, I

think ,was used last session, they should "synchronize" their efforts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is only one of the many publications which some of our banks in Canada are issuing. I should like to see some limitation on the rate of interest if for no other reason than to stop the banks from publishing so much information gratis. The people of this country are burdened with advice. If the farmers read all these pamphlets, circulars, and publications of one kind and another that come to them I am afraid they would not have time to get their work done. I really think the Bank of Commerce would show better judgment if they would cease the publication of their "Farm News Letter," and a great deal of other literature which they circulate among the public free of charge. They issue every year what I think they call a year book; they issue an annual statement containing a very carefully prepared address by the general manager, and I think, by the president. They issue, I think, a weekly commercial letter and several other publications. The Bank of Commerce is not the only bank which pursues this practice, but I just happened to have its publications in my possession to-night. I hope no hon. member will think I am reflecting on the Bank of Commerce particularly, but I happen to know more about its publications—at any rate more of them come to me. I think, Mr. Chairman, if our banks were managed even as efficiently as our farms they could operate and do so very safely and get a very handsome return on a maximum rate of 7 per cent.

Now, I am sure the statement, made, I think by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), that the rate of interest on money loaned was regulated by the law of supply and demand—is not borne out by the facts of the case because away back in 1906, I think, or 1907, I can remember that the rate of interest, in the locality where I live at any rate, was exactly the same as it was two or three years ago when the banks were urging us to borrow money. In 1907,—or was it 1908?—the banks said that money was very tight, but as I remember it the rate of interest was just the same as it is now.

In regard to what the hon. member for Halifax said about competition regulating the rate of interest I want to quote if I shall not be wearying the committee by talking at too great a length,—I do not want to do that,—a little from the report of Professor McGibbon which will enable my hon. friend to see how much competition there is between the banks. I will select the particular part which I want so that I will not make the quotation too lengthy. There was before Professor McGibbon the superintendent of the Alberta branches of the Bank of Commerce and towards the close of the evidence the report says:

A. That arose there perhaps from the fact that some clerk, to save him trouble, found it easier to put it through that way.

He is referring to the practice of discounting as opposed to the practice of charging interest.

These are checked up by our auditors every year and if they find that it has been done they draw attention to it. The desire is to maintain a uniform practice.

Then this question by Professor McGibbon:

Q. Going back to the Winnipeg arrangement, there was a general understanding?

A. I would not say that. On that question you cited you have the evidence of a bank manager and (at) another point that all the time he was stationed there he never discounted a farmer's note.

Q. It was an understanding as far as you were concerned?

A. So far as we were concerned we decided it was a wrong practice to depart from the old custom.

Q. You discussed it?

A. We discussed it with the other banks, Yes. Those things come up at the meeting of the men interested in that business the same as in any other business.

Q. And the bankers naturally discuss very—discussed various aspects of that with a view to deciding upon a general policy?

A. Yes, that I presume was the purpose of the Canadian Bankers' Association.

Q. I understood it was a meeting in Winnipeg, it was the Canadian Bankers' Association was it?

A. No, but I say that was the purpose. No doubt the purpose of the (for which) Canadian Banker's Association was organized. There is a subsection of the organization in Winnipeg.

Q. And it was in that section that it was discussed?

A. Yes, I think so.

Then over on the next page the evidence of the supervisor of the Royal Bank for Alberta, who was being examined by this commissioner, is given. The question put was:

Q. Now, with regard to the compounding of interest, do you consider that equally vital to a review of the loan?

A. In our institution it is founded on practice entirely, it has never been objected to by a very large proportion of our desirable farmers.

Q. And in a general way you actively began to insist upon that within the last year or year and a half?

A. Yes, in a general way as the result of the understanding.

It goes on to state that the effect of the agreement is to impose a higher rate of charges on the clients of the bank. Now, as the result of a good number of years' experience

in western Canada, I make the statement that there is very little competition among the banks in the matter of interest. There is some competition in service, of course. For instance, the banks like to get your business if your account is good, but they endeavour to secure it through courtesy and attention, just the same as one grocer hopes to attract, by means of a better service, the custom that goes to his rival. I do not think there is anything new in the statement I am making, that there is no competition among the banks so far as the rate of interest is concerned. As a matter of history you can find the same thing stated in the evidence of Mr. McLeod before the banking committee ten years ago.

Now, I think I have taken up about all the time I should, but I trust that at least I have given the committee some information of which it was not possessed before. It may well be, of course, that I have not; but in that event I should be disappointed. Before I sit down however I want to read to hon. members some of the rates of interest paid by our banks last year, which of course was, we are told, a bad year for every one, banks included. The lowest rate of dividend paid was 6 per cent; then I find two at 7 per cent; one at 8 per cent; one at 9 per cent; two at ten per cent; 7 at 12 per cent; one at 14 per cent; and, I think, 1 at 16 per cent.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): When the hon. member finds bank stock paying 12 per cent —and I have in mind one that does pay that rate—he must bear in mind that in a good many cases the shares are worth $200 each, and that much and more in some cases was paid for such shares so that a dividend of 14 per cent would as a matter of fact be only 7 per cent. It is not fair for the hon. member to put the statement in the way he has submitted it to the committee without a further explanation.

Mr. COOTE: The present market price of Bank of Commerce stock is $199, yielding 6·53 per cent; the present price of Royal Bank stock is $218, yielding about 6·42 per cent; the present market price of Bank of Hamilton stock is $170, yielding 7·06 per cent; the price of Imperial Bank stock is $188, yielding about 6·91 per cent; the price of Standard Bank is $212, yielding 6·60 per cent; Dominion Bank is $200, yielding 6½ per cent; the price of Bank of Montreal stock is $240, yielding 5·83 per cent. I am simply trying to show the splendid earnings which these banks in Canada have made, indicating the sound position they are in. I am sure that if our banks were carefully managed, so that they did not incur the loss of so many million dollars, as was shown in the case of the Merchants Bank and some other banks that I will not mention—some of these losses having been incurred outside Canada—they could return a very good rate of interest even at the present market price of these stocks, and even if they were limited to 7 per cent.

Mr. VIEN: Does the hon. member think that the Canadian banks can do better in Canada than the United States banks can do over there? And does he think that we should limit the Canadian banks to 7 per cent when the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States charges from 6 to 10 per cent interest, according to the districts in which they do business?

Mr. COOTE: I am not aware that the Federal Reserve Bank is charging 10 per cent. I am sorry I have not the information here but the statement was sent to me a few days ago by a man—

Mr. VIEN: The hon. member was in the committee when the documents were read and when that particular information was given.

Mr. COOTE: I do not remember these figures having been given to the committee; if they were they must have been wrong, because I am informed by an hon. member that that bank is limited by statute to 7 per cent.

Mr. VIEN: I would remind the hon. member that when the hon. member for Vancouver spoke on the question of interest he gave the rates charged by the Federal Reserve Bank in the United States, varying from 6 to 10 per cent according to the district.

Mr. LADNER: The hon. member was mistaken.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LADNER: The maximum rate is 7 per cent.

Mr. VIEN: When I referred to the member for Vancouver I had in mind the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens).

Mr. COOTE: I assure the committee I am glad to have the support of my hon. friend from Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner).

Mr. STEVENS: With the permission of the hon. member I may straighten this little dispute because it is really of importance. The document I quoted from was the Federal

Reserve report for April of this year; if I remember rightly it was dated April 15th. It gave the rates of interest charged in some 12 or 15 leading American cities, ranging from 6 per cent to 10 per cent. These were the rates charged by the commercial banks of the country throughout the United States for prime commercial paper.

Mr. COOTE: Is the hon. member stating that 10 per cent was charged by the Federal Reserve Bank?

Mr. STEVENS: I thought I had made it plain. I said that these were the rates charged by the commercial banks of the United States for prime commercial paper.

Mr. COOTE: Possibly we have it straight now. I move in amendment that subsection 1 of section 91 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The bank may stipulate for, take, reserve, or exact any rate of interest or discount but not exceeding 8 per cent per annum and may receive and take in advance any set rate.

(2) The rate of interest or discount charged by the bank shall appear on the face of the note, bill or other evidence of debt.

(3) In the event that a greater rate than 8 per cent per annum has been paid to the Bank, then the person by whom it has been paid or his legal representative, may recover in any court the excess interest thus paid, provided such action is commenced within two years from the time such excess interest was paid.

(4) In any suit, action or other proceeding concerning a bank loan wherein it is alleged that the amount of interest paid or claimed exceeds the rate of eight per centum per annum, the court may reopen the transaction and take an account between the parties, and may, notwithstanding any statement of settlement of account, or any contract purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, reopen any account already taken between the parties, and relieve the person under obligation to pay from payment of any sum in excess of the legal rate of interest and if any such excess has been paid, or allowed in account, by the debtor, may order the bank to repay it, and may set aside either wholly or in part, or revise, or alter, any security given in respect of the transaction.

The latter part of the amendment is the same as that moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). I hope this amendment will receive the support of the committee. Surely we have met any reasonable objections which hon. members might have to the amendment which was moved previously. I think most hon. members will admit that 8 per cent is the limit which any man should pay if he has security to entitle him to a loan. If he is not entitled to a loan on account of the security which he has to offer unless he is willing to pay 12 or 13 per cent, I feel exactly like Professor McGibbon who said in his report that it would be better for that man if he did not get a loan. I hope that this amendment will meet a better fate than the one moved by the hon. member for Calgary West.

Mr. IRVINE: Before we enter upon a discussion of the new amendment, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if it is his intention that we should sit as late as we did last night. It is now nearly midnight, and I should like to ask if the intention is to keep the committee in session for an indefinite time?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is mistaken. We have not been keeping the House in session.

Mr. IRVINE: Then I move that the Chairman do now leave the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: All right. That motion is always in order.

Motion (Mr. Irvine) negatived.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Possibly the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) was under the impression that if we raised the ante one point, the committee might consider his amendment more favourably, and I have no doubt in the world that if someone would move that the rate of interest should be raised to 25 per cent, everybody on the opposite side of the House would vote in favour of that. May I, however, before opening my remarks on the amendment, express my regret that the Minister of Finance cannot see his way to accede to the request of the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) to allow this debate to continue to-morrow? You will have noted that to-day every facility has been given on this side of the House, until this very important clause came up, to the passage of amendments as well as clauses. We have progressed very well, as well as we have done on any other important bill, and again I say that it is with regret that I find myself compelled to continue debating this clause at this late hour. As far as observation can show me, it is practically futile for any hon. member in this corner of the House to try to present arguments, good, bad or indifferent, that will have any influence whatever on hon. members, both opposite and to my right. To some extent their position may be governed—I do not say that it is, but it is a probability—by the extraordinary attitude of a part of the press. For example I find in the Standard of Montreal a long editorial, rather scurrilous in character, dealing with the Bank Act. It is headed: "Put the Bank Act through." And it ends up with this

12 m.

paragraph. Hon. members are entitled to know this if they have not already read it, and I am surprised that some of the hon. members in either of the two historic parties have not taken exception to it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I do not think the hon. member would be in order to read a newspaper extract discrediting or written in a manner to discredit the proceedings of this House.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is not discrediting to those who adhere to partisanship. The editorial—and I need not read it; I can give the important part very briefly to you—ends up with a paragraph somewhat to this effect, that now is the time for the two historic parties to bury the hatchet and to unite in order to force through the Bank Act at this session. It is sad to say that there are only too many of such editorials and such articles appearing in the free press of Canada at this time.

Mr. COOTE: Get them to unite and bring down the rate of interest.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Hopeless. This question of interest rates is, without doubt, the most vital one facing western Canada to-day. Because of a series of bad years in places, because of low prices for the crops that were raised in other places, because of a general process of deflation involving live stock, grain and other produce of all kinds, because, to a large extent, of the Fordney tariff practically prohibiting the entry of cattle from Canada into the United States, because of the tariff which this country has imposed and which bears heavily upon the people of western Canada, because of the high transportation rates and combines, but especially because of high interest rates, the condition of the farmers of western Canada is reduced to a state of almost insolvency. You find to-day by far the greater majority of the farmers of western Canada carrying great accumulated amounts of debt, upon which they are paying interest rates that have been increasing during the last two years and that are now at a point that the farmers cannot continue to pay them and stay in the farming business. What is the use of filling up that country with immigrants if they cannot live when they come there? We cannot contend that this is not a national question, and it is a sad sight to me to see hon. members opposite dealing with the matter in the most perfunctory manner, disregarding every argument brought to bear on it from this side. It seems utterly useless to endeavour to influence their minds in this matter, and we have no hope of being able to. Hon. members have no proposals before the committee for a rural credit scheme, and I venture to say that it is impossible that they will have one at this session. Therefore, there is no hope. We will come back next year—at least some may; we cannot tell what may happen—and there may be another discussion, but we have no guarantee that there will be a discussion of this question.

May I for a moment endeavour to intimate to hon. members who will listen—and some ought to listen—the manner in which loans are taken out in western Canada? A farmer may happen to require a loan in the spring to carry on the year's farming operations. He goes to the bank manager, and he makes out a statement. He states to him every asset he has, the amount of the stock and its value, the amount of the improvements and their value, the amount of his land and its value, and if he does not own it all, his equity in the land, the number of buildings he has and so on. In short he gives him a regular bank statement of all his assets. The bank manager will then say to him: "I will refer this matter to the office at Calgary"—or Saskatoon or Winnipeg, as the case may be—"and I will let you know the result in a week or ten days." At the end of that time the farmer goes in, and if he is very fortunate, the manager extends the loan at a rate of eight per cent. That is the general procedure until, as I say, recent years. With the rate of eight per cent the farmer is about to leave satisfied, but on reading the note he discovers that it is made out for three months and he tells the manager that he cannot pay it in three months; that that will be in the midst of his summer operations, and he will have nothing to sell at that time of the year. The reply is that that is a mere formality, and that the farmer can come in at the end of the three months and renew the note. At the end of three months the farmer goes back to have that note renewed, and the bank manager generally informs him that unfortunately, conditions are not as good as they were when he issued the note, or he gives some other excuse. He may say that money is tightening. He has got to call in the loan. If the farmer cannot pay now he is told, "Well, we will renew the loan all right, but you will have to give us additional security and perhaps an increased rate of interest or both." However, it has not been the general practice of the banks to increase the rate of interest until the end of the year. At that time, if it has been impossible for the farmer to pay his full indebtedness—and I may say that owing to present conditions

there have been very few who have been able to pay their debts in full in western Canada—the procedure is to increase the rate of interest and, whenever possible, obtain all additional security.

The banks go further. If the farmer has any liquid assets, such as live stock, then, disregarding entirely market conditions, he is absolutely obliged to put them up for sale. My constituency is about 12,000 square miles in area and is situated in the most densely populated portion of Alberta. My hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer) represents a constituency which runs into the north country and is entirely a mixed farming district. The southern half of my constituency happens to be devoted to grain growing entirely, but the northern portion is like that of my friend from Battle River a mixed farming district. We sent out a questionnaire to our constituents some time ago, and the answers we received indicate that wherever stock-raising was engaged in a few years ago the banks encouraged the farmers to purchase more stock. I can give the committee my own practical experience in this respect. I happened to attend a stock sale at the Pat Burns Imperial ranch at Rumsey a few years ago and the manager of the local bank was also present. As a matter of fact he was sitting on the top rail of the corral beside me. I happened to have plenty of feed that year and I said to him, "Do you think this stock would be a safe investment?" He said, "You cannot make any mistake in such an investment." I asked him, "Will you advance me the necessary money to purchase some of this stock if you think it is all right?" "Certainly," he said, "you can have as much credit as is necessary to stock your farm." I accepted the offer and was encouraged to purchase stock at $75 to $85 a head. I admit that I should not have been so foolish, but I took it for granted that the bank manager knew conditions, and so I followed his advice. That kind of advice has been followed unfortunately by all too many farmers in western Canada. Credit has also been urged upon them by a system of propaganda something like this: Do not put all your eggs into one basket—go in for mixed farming—if you want to go in for hogs come and see your branch manager—if you want to go in for cattle come and see your branch manager—we advise you to go into dairying, see your bank manager. We were encouraged, we went to see our bank manager, and as a result we invested in these things—many of us to our great regret. After having held that live stock for two or three years the market, as you know, fell to pieces when the Fordney tariff was put into effect. But no mercy was shown by the banks. Our stock was there, our productive capacity was there, but owing to causes over which we had no control the price of cattle broke badly. Did the banks of western Canada help the farmers to tide over that period? Did they say to us, "We will not press you, we will help you to carry on until conditions improve and you can find a market for your stock?" I mentioned to one bank manager the possibility of the removal of the British embargo on cattle. He laughed at me and said, "That is simply a political football; it will never be removed." And the farmers were forced to sell their cattle. I use the word "forced" advisedly. A farmer who had a poor crop and could get little or nothing for it was compelled to sell his other liquid assets to meet his bank loan. In many cases after such forced sales the farmers still owed money to the banks. Many of these farmers had to give additional mortgages at 9 per cent. At the present time I am paying 9 per cent on a ten-year mortgage.

We cannot any longer pay that rate either to the mortgage companies or to the banks, and if this committee does not take some steps to restrict the profiteering banks I cannot without hesitation tell hon. members what will happen. Certainly I hate to think of the future condition of western Canada. After all, this is a national question. Our prosperity out there will influence conditions in the East. If we ever get out of this morass of debt, not only will the country generally be improved immensely through productive development by hopeful farmers, but this prosperity will have a reflex effect on the business of eastern Canda. If hon. members will discuss the present situation with any business men in this city, they will be answered as I was answered the other day. I asked one business man what he thought were the prospects for the fall trade, and he replied, "They do not look good." But I said, "We are going to have a good crop in western Canada this year." He said, "Yes, but I am afraid you cannot pay your debts." And it was only too true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to place on record one or two examples, not at great length, of the oppressive character of banking practice in western Canada. This is a letter concluding answers to the questionnaire received from Mr. Ç. A. Wynn of Carmangay, Alberta, and is typical. He writes:

> This particular district was settled up by people from eastern Canada and the States some eighteen years ago. They have built up comfortable homes here only to find themselves faced with the situation where it will take practically all their crop to pay the interest on their loans. So for this reason quite a num-

ber are contemplating leaving the country almost at once, crop or no crop, unless there is some relief in sight.

Here are a few of the questions set out on the questionnaire with the answers received:

14. Has your bank requested payment of their clients' liabilities in full with the promise of extension of credit?
A. Yes.
15. Has your bank ever broken its promise to reissue credit as per previous question?
A. Yes.
16. If so, in about what percentage of cases?
A. Could not say definitely, but perhaps 25 per cent.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that those bankers who may read some part of these proceedings would be well advised to take to heart this admonition: Do not encourage or permit local branch managers to urge a farmer to liquidate a debt regardless of cost at the end of the year on the promise of a renewal of credit for the coming years' operations unless the bank is willing to extend the line of credit. Only too many cases have arisen where the banker has encouraged liquidation at all costs and promised a renewal of credit, but has afterward broken his pledge. That is not going to improve conditions in western Canada, nor is it going to increase the confidence of our farmers in the banking system.

Touching briefly on the answers to the questionnaire I sent out, I would say that the term of a note to the farmer in western Canada is three months. Hon. members can well undestand that that is altogether too short. The interest charge in all districts is never lower than 8 per cent, and in most of the 12,000 square miles—and my hon. friend from Battle River has exactly similar answers covering another 12,000 square miles corroborating in every degree the answers I have received from the southern part of the province—it is 8 per cent compounded, or over. Now, that situation cannot continue. In by far the great majority of cases, all notes are discounted, at time of issue. But it is not a constant practice; there are a few cases reported where a farmer, observing that the banker is discounting the note at the time of issue protests so vigorously that the banker has been known not to insist on the discount. But too few farmers have the courage to insist, and I do not know whether they would be successful if they insisted as a whole.

Every one of these reports—and I have roughly one hundred of them—indicates that it is impossible under present conditions in western Canada to carry on at 8 per cent or over. A large number of these reports deal with caveats filed by the bank against grain so that as soon as a farmer has hauled his grain to the elevator the elevator company makes the cash ticket out to the bank instead of to the farmer. I do not know whether in most of these cases there was collusion with the elevator companies, but I had a letter from Mr. H. W. Leonard, secretary of the Constituency Association at Tudor, Alberta, near Rockyford, in which he stated that an attempt had been made by the bank manager there—I believe it was the Bank of Commerce—to get the elevators to act as collectors for the banks last year at harvest time when the grain was coming in; but fortunately the elevators refused to act. The depletion of the population due to the condition out there is so appalling that I hesitate to give the facts to the committee. But reverting for a moment to the question of interest rates, may I say that in respect to those 12,000 square miles I have received reports from twenty-seven large districts in which the interest is 8 per cent compounded, 9 per cent, 10 per cent, and, in some cases 12 per cent. For example, in the district of Morrin notes are issued compounded every three months at 8 per cent. In the district of Craigmyle, the rate is 9 per cent, Royal Bank; Big Valley, 9 per cent, Royal Bank and Imperial Bank; Delia, 9 per cent, Bank of Montreal and Bank of Commerce; Hanna, from 8 to 10 per cent and in some cases 12 per cent, Bank of Toronto, Bank of Commerce, Union Bank. In the district of Parr the average is 9 per cent—and by the way, in case a question may be asked me, I would inform the hon. senior member for Halifax that these are averages; they are not isolated instances. The average at Parr is 9 per cent; that is the average for the whole district. At Richdale, it is 10 per cent, Bank of Toronto; at Gleichen, 8 per cent, Bank of Commerce and Royal Bank; at Sunnynook, 8 per cent, Union Bank and Bank of Toronto; at Pandora, 9 per cent, Bank of Toronto; Lonebutte, 9 per cent, Union Bank and Bank of Commerce; Carolside, 9 per cent, Union Bank and Bank of Toronto; Cessford, 10 per cent, Bank of Toronto; Clivale, 8 and 9 per cent, Bank of Commerce and Union Bank; Halliday, 9 per cent, Union Bank; Carmangay, 8 per cent, Bank of Commerce; Vulcan, 9 per cent, Bank of Hamilton, and so on. That will give hon. members a fairly accurate idea of the situation there and the rates of interest we have been charged. The hon. senior member for Halifax refers to the costs of operating branch banks, of the expansion of operations of the banks, as one of the causes for the higher rates of interest in the West.

May I remind him in that connection that efforts were made in the committee on Banking and Commerce to recall the bankers in order to ask them specifically for that information. We had no evidence before the committee on Banking and Commerce that would justify the hon. member for Halifax in making that statement—not one tittle of evidence to that effect was adduced. We had simply the bald statements of two bankers, but no evidence. We made an effort to secure that evidence, but the request was refused by the committee; we who asked for it were voted down.

I need not deal further with the question of competition; it has been gone into very fully by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote). But I would like to touch on the other aspect of the western Canadian banking conditions that have led to high interest rates, and ask the question, is it our fault, or is it the banks' fault? I wish to quote from page 88 of a book by Mr. William Long Baker entitled "Money Monopoly vs. the Community Dollar." Mr. Baker was formerly supervisor of branches for the Standard Bank of Canada, but he left that position to endeavour to form and secure a charter for a commonwealth bank in this country. He says:

It was remarked at the beginning of the preceding chapter that while the banks act in concert in matters furthering their own interests, such as interest rate, legislation and all subjects and phases likely to culminate in organized opposition, yet they are engaged with one another in a struggle for supremacy in business and we have seen a contest between two banks for leading place as Canada's greatest bank. Every bank is trying to show larger totals, larger business than its class competitor. This has led to one of the most insane practices imaginable, that of opening branches where they are not required.

Now, that is only too true, I will not delay the committee in going into the aspect of the question, Mr. Chairman, but you have heard the statements of hon. members around me. The hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) dealt with that point; he mentioned High River as an example, as well as some other towns. I could mention dozens of places where two or more banks are operating but where there is not business enough for one. I quote further from Mr. Baker's work:

It seems hardly possible that men who preach economy, efficiency and avoidance of unnecessary expansion—

And that is the advice we have from bankers.

—would themselves practise the very reverse. Two banks have been known to open their offices in a village on the same day, in fact this may be said to be a common occurrence. Bank A and Bank B may each have a branch at X. A few miles away is a small farming locality where Bank A has deposits of $100,000 lodged at their X office. Bank B conceives the idea of opening a branch at the smaller locality and Bank A jumps in immediately to protect its business. There is not enough business to warrant one branch but the fight for business, no, for deposits, goes on, at the expense of the public, and at the expense of clerks who eke out a bare existence on half pay. An analysis of Canada's branches made some time ago, showed the following:

I would ask hon. members of the committee to listen to this statement of fact:

1,970	places	with	1 branch
515	"	"	2 branches
115	"	"	3 "
42	"	"	4 "
18	"	"	5 "
16	"	"	6 "
6	"	"	7 "
8	"	"	8 "
3	"	"	9 "
5	"	"	10 "
1	"	"	11 "
2	"	"	12 "
3	"	"	13 "
2	"	"	14 "
1	"	"	17 "
1	"	"	18 "
1	"	"	23 "
2	"	"	24 "
1	"	"	26 "
1	"	"	39 "
1	"	"	43 "
1	"	"	45 "
1	"	"	55 "
1	"	"	82 "
1	"	"	87 "
1	"	"	220 "

Of the branches located in points where there is only one bank, there are probably 300 which could be closed with profit to the bank and without serious inconvenience to the people.

I wish to support that statement.

Five hundred and fifteen offices at two-branch points—

"Two-branch points"—points where there are two branch banks.

—could be closed, as there are no towns with only two banks where one could not do the work. It is not necessary to deal with each class, but anyone may estimate that 1,600 branches could be closed releasing probably $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 of capital— and making an annual saving of $12,000,000. This would be allowing an average of less than $8,000 for salaries of manager and staff, rents and all incidental expenses. Additional staff might be required at many points to handle the increased business and there would naturally be some additional expense, but in the majority of cases it would be found that no extra staff would be required. Think of it! Wasting, we shall say, eight or ten million dollars each year in a race for supremacy, in a mad scramble for deposits while bank clerks live or try to live on starvation salaries.

That alone is not the whole story. Not only did they expand into these places where they are not needed, not only did they double and treble the number of branches at places where the business would justify but one, but they built as one hon. gentleman has said, the most expensive buildings in the town. They

fitted them with the most expensive furnishings, and filled them with the most luxurious flowers and ferns and creeping plants so that you enter a most gorgeous palace when you go into the bank, hat in hand, and go down on your knees to borrow money. When I came a homesteader to my present town nearly eighteen years ago, there was no bank, but there came to it two years later an assistant bank manager from a town in that district. He came up by train twice a week to a little shack about twelve by sixteen with a counter in it, and he performed all the functions of a bank in that district admirably. But that was not good enough. Just as soon as the bank could get around to it a contract for a store-shaped building was made and a large frame structure secured. Into it were placed most expensive fittings, with elaborate counters, swivel chairs and costly furniture of all kinds. But still that was not enough. Within eighteen years they had jumped from a shack to a one-storey frame shack, to a two-storey frame building with solid oak partitions between the offices and the outer public hall and with a specially built floor, and as I said, the inside was festooned with green creeping things in order to harmonize with the green things that came in there to borrow money.

That is not an isolated case by any means, Mr. Chairman. It is a common everyday sight in the West. Sixteen miles to the south of that town there are two large banks, one of them a large two-storey brick building and the other an expensively-built frame building. One of these banks of half the size could accommodate all the business that is to be done in that town, but there you have two immense banks with all these expensive fittings. That is one of the reasons possibly why the rate of interest is so high. The other reason may be because it is necessary to pay the large and persistent dividends. That deals with the waste and extravagance, and that may be the answer to the manager of the Weyburn Security Bank and to Sir John Aird and all the others who told us they could not carry on in western Canada if the rate of interest was reduced to 7 or 8 per cent. Their argument holds no water. No evidence has been adduced by them in support of it. We asked for someone to come before the committee and give evidence as to the average cost of managing a bank in western Canada, and we did not get them before that committee.

I have one last suggestion to make. If the hon. members of this House do not see fit to pass the amendment offered now by the hon. member for Macleod I would ask them to be logical and strike out something that is useless. If you will not pass the amendment to this section, strike the section out. It is a camouflage, or worse, a futile falsehood. It does not guarantee anything to anybody, but the section is in the act in order to give confidence to the people. "There is a rate of interest fixed in Canada, and the banks cannot charge any more than the legal rate," is the false message conveyed. That is an utter farce, Mr. Chairman. Why perpetuate it? Cut it out, and let us be honest with ourselves and with the people who borrow money from the banks of Canada.

Mr. SHAW: I just want to make one or two observations because I am anxious to see the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Agriculture vote against this particular amendment. I want to commend to the attention of the House this amendment. It will be observed that the maximum statutory rate of interest it proposes to fix is 8 per cent. The facts which have been disclosed in this debate indicate that the average earnings of all the banks in Canada are in every case less than that figure and consequently I think we can urge in sincerity and with fairness that a maximum rate of 8 per cent should certainly not under those circumstances be considered unreasonable.

I think there is one thing on which the branch banking system of Canada prides itself, and that is that the system allows of a great deal of fluidity so that money flows rapidly from one section where it is in excess to another section where it is needed. If that is the fact, it is a strange thing that from the reservoirs of wealth in eastern Canada it costs so much to supply the needs of western Canada. This supplying of needs is not a one-sided arrangement. It is not something done by the East for western Canada without compensation. As a matter of fact the development in western Canada has made possible the great development in eastern Canada within the last ten or twenty years. Each is dependent on the other. If you are going to stifle any one part, your action necessarily has the same effect with regard to the other part. So while I am prepared to say the rate is in excess of what it ought to be, I urge the committee to accept the amendment in order that a maximum rate may be set.

There is another matter I want to point out to the committee. If you will observe the recent legislation in the United States you will find that the farmers of that country, western farmers as well as eastern farmers will shortly be provided with money at rates

varying from 5½ to 7 per cent. Those farmers must compete in exactly the same market in which our farmers compete. They must compete in the world market under practically similar conditions. Now how can our farmers expect to compete successfully with their competitors in the States who can secure capital at a very much less rate? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that to simply ignore the demand of western Canada in this connection is to bang the door in its face and say: We have no concern with your affairs in this matter—and indirectly to say: You have no concern with your own affairs. I think the amendment proposed is not an unreasonable one and that it should commend itself to the House.

Mr. GOOD: I had expected yesterday to speak at considerable length on this question of the interest rate, but I do not want to speak to-night and I do not think anybody here wants me to speak. I would think the Minister of Finance would be courteous to the House if he would permit it to adjourn the debate until to-morrow. If not, it simply means that he is exercising the power which he has to suppress discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. GOOD: I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to speak to-night under the circumstances. I simply give expression to this view that we ought after last night's experience to have a little chance of debating this matter to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING: It is always possible for a minority to insist that they are right and that everybody else is wrong. May I suggest to my hon. friend there is just a possibility that those who differ from him may be right. That is all.

Mr. GOOD: I am not questioning that at all. I simply say that under the circumstances I do not feel justified in saying what I would under ordinary circumstances feel obligated to say.

Amendment negatived: Yeas 24, Nays 50.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Wednesday).

Wednesday, June 20, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Eighth report of the select standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 225, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

He said: The bill explains itself. The old clauses appear in the bill and the amendments are shown in italics. The first clause extends the interpretation of the word "chemist." When prosecutions were taken under the act it was often the case that the certificate of an assistant or junior chemist in the department, by whom the work was actually done, was refused by the court, and it became necessary to send our chemist down from the department to the court. The interpretation is extended to include any employee classified as junior chemist, assistant chemist or chemist in a laboratory in the Department of Customs and Excise or of any department of the government. The second clause makes the presentation of the certificate of the chemist prima facie evidence of his capacity to act as such. The third clause is to provide a penalty for those who deodorize denatured alcohol. Under part 10 of the Inland Revenue Act, only methylated alcohol was mentioned; we now add denatured alcohol.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GRAIN SURVEYS

Mr. BOWEN:

Is the original official sample of grain on which the grade is determined by the inspection department used in case of a survey (or re-survey) of this grain?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: The party asking for a survey on any car of grain has the privilege of requesting that the survey be held on the original sample, or on a fresh sample, drawn by an official of this department, if and when the car is in such a position or location that a fresh sample can be secured.

It has always been the practice of this department to secure fresh samples for survey purposes when requested, if at all possible to do so.

The great majority of samples placed before the Survey board are fresh samples.

WELLAND CANAL—TOWING

Mr. BENOIT:

1. How much of the towing on the Welland Canal, given by the Department of Railways and Canals, since 1917, was done by Captain William Hand, and what was he paid for this work?
2. Does the Superintendent of the Welland Canal open the tenders for towing and does he make recommendations thereon?
3. Did Captain Hand tender for towing, in December, 1921, at $5.50 per hour?
4. Was he awarded the tender at a greater amount?
5. What are the names of others who tendered on this towing, and what were the amounts of their respective tenders?
6. Who opened these tenders submitted in November and December, 1921?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Of the total paid by the Department of Railways and Canals for towing on the Welland canal since March 1, 1917, amounting to $26,035.57, Captain William Hand received $3,810.50 for this work. The total amount he received is made up as follows: 3 days at $100; 38 hours at $20; 22 hours at $17; 27 hours at $13.50; 127 hours at $10; 11 hours at $7; 80 hours at $5.50.

Return trip from Port Dalhousie to Port Maitland and Dunnville—$225.

2. Usually tugs are engaged at established rates, time not permitting the calling for tenders. When desirable to obtain quotations, the superintending engineer opens the letters and accepts the lowest offer.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. John Harrigan—$6 per hour.

6. L. D. Hara, superintending engineer, Welland canal.

GRAIN ELEVATORS

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. For what term is the lease of the G.T.P. elevator at Fort William, and the C.N.R. elevator at Port Arthur?
2. To whom are they leased?
3. When will their leases terminate?
4. Are tenders being called, or about to be called, for the leasing of these two elevators?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The lease of the Grand Trunk elevator at Fort William is for a term of ten years; for the C.N.R. elevator at Port Arthur, one year.

2. The G.T.P. elevator is leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator Company, Limited; the C.N.R. elevator to the Port Arthur Elevator Company, Limited.

3. Grand Trunk Pacific lease will expire on August 1, 1930; C.N.R., on August 31, 1923.

4. For Port Arthur, yes; Fort William lease in effect until August 1, 1930.

COMMUTED PENSIONS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce at this session legislation for the relief of returned men who have been induced to commute their pensions?
2. If so, of what nature will such relief be?

Hon. Mr. BELAND: No men were induced to accept final payment of pension. Pensioners who voluntarily accepted final payment, who are dissatisfied, have been afforded an opportunity to present their complaints to the government through the medium of the royal commission appointed to investigate questions relating to pensions and re-establishment, and it is expected the matter will be covered in the final report of the commission.

MORNING AND SATURDAY SITTINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.): I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the government have considered the advisability of having the House sit Saturday next, and also holding morning sittings beginning with to-morrow or at a very early day, with a view of reaching prorogation by the 28th or 29th of this month? Perhaps the Prime Minister would like to have the opinion of the House on this question.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government has had both these points under consideration. The government is as anxious as the members to prorogue before the end of the month, but we have not thought it necessary to begin morning sittings this week or to sit this Saturday. In all probability we shall begin morning sittings next week.

HALIBUT TREATY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): I would like to ask the government what is proposed to be done in connection with the halibut treaty?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): It will be submitted to the House in a few days.

CATTLE EMBARGO—INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I would like to make an inquiry of the government with reference to an order for return passed on the 12th of February last asking for the correspondence between the Canadian government and the government of Great Britain regarding the embargo against Canadian store cattle. I would also like to know if it is the intention of the government to withhold this information until after the provincial elections in Ontario are over. In view of the reckless statements being made by the Premier of Ontario and others—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:—I think it is important that the return should be brought down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The return will be brought down almost immediately. I may say to my hon. friend that it has been represented to the government through the High Commissioner that the British government desire that part of the correspondence should be regarded as confidential; however, the government will see to it that all the correspondence is presented to the right hon. leader of the Opposition and he may judge what in his opinion should be so regarded. I think that any correspondence that is not laid on the Table will be simply of a character that might create embarrassment overseas, but which will not affect the situation so far as this country is concerned.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on Bill No. 83, respecting banks and banking, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: I would ask the attention of the House for a moment to be permitted to return to section 80. A suggestion was made by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Kellner) for a certain amendment to that section in regard to exemptions in the western country. In substance we desire to accept the hon. gentleman's amendment. The wording is slightly different in the amendment I propose, but I am quite sure he will be content with it. I beg to move that section 80 be amended by adding after the word "property," in the third line, the following:

> Provided, however, that no mortgage or hypotheque shall be taken, held or disposed of in respect to or be deemed to include any personal property which at the date of the coming into force of this act is by any statutory enactment exempt from seizure under writs of execution.

I think that is substantially the same as my hon. friend proposes.

Mr. KELLNER: The amendment is satisfactory to me. It is practically what I had intended.

Amendment (Mr. Kellner) withdrawn.

Mr MEIGHEN: The effect of this would be to disenable a man from mortgaging to a bank anything that would be exempt under the laws of the province in case of writ of execution.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, confined to personal property.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am disposed to think it will be more injurious to the public than to the banks.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That was pointed out.

Amendment (Mr. Fielding) agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 92—Percentage chargeable for collection.

Mr. KELLNER: I would like to point out that in this section the maximum and minimum rates of discount are both fixed. When we were discussing section 91 yesterday the government argued that it would be impracticable to fix a maximum rate of interest. It seems to me very peculiar that in section 91 we decide that it would be wholly impossible for us to fix a maximum rate of interest and then in section 93 we fix both maximum and minimum rates of discount. I would suggest to the minister that it might be desirable to strike out section 93 entirely.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is no similarity between the rate charged in the way of exchange and the rate of interest charged. Section 91 referred to the rate of interest charged for the loan of money. This section refers to charges made for banking service.

Mr. COOTE: Might I ask the hon. member if it is fair to the bank to insist that they shall collect a cheque on some branch located, say, in the Yukon at the same rate as a cheque on a branch located in the same province?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is a matter of practice, I suppose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there any restriction in the act as to what a bank may charge on foreign collections, which are practically all or nearly all in the United States?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think there is any special mention of foreign collections.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think there should be.

Section agreed to.

On section 99—Bank may sell assets to another bank.

Mr. SHAW: The sections from 98 on to 103 I think are the sections under which mergers of banks are consummated. As I read the sections they are in substantial conformity with the provisions of the act as it was revised in 1913. In other words there has been substantially no change. Now, in view of the fact that the banks have decreased from the number of twenty-four I think it was, to seventeen, does not the minister think it advisable that some restricting clauses should be enacted which would prevent an undue centralization of money?

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend would have difficulty in defining any way to accomplish that. I suppose he approaches this question from the point of view that a merger is necessarily a bad thing—

Mr. SHAW: Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING:—I am not able to concur in that view; I think there may be cases in which a merger is a very good thing. I have known cases in the past where a bank in fairly good position was on the down grade, and by being taken over by another bank it was saved; every good interest was promoted by the merger. There may be a similar case in the future. I am quite prepared to admit there may be need in the future of some mergers. I think as a rule they should be discouraged, but circumstances may arise which may render a merger necessary and proper. It has been suggested that a merger should only be made by a special act of parliament. I could not approve of that because the circumstances under which a merger may be deemed necessary may be very urgent, and to wait until parliament could convene might be to destroy the possibility of the merger going through and to lead to serious trouble. I am not anxious to promote mergers unnecessarily, but I cannot conceive of any arrangement that could be made which would be better than that which we already have.

Mr. SHAW: I observe that under the provisions of this bill the minister is empowered, if he considers it in the public interest, to give his consent to a merger. Well, during the last ten years one such application has been refused.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes?

Mr. SHAW: And the remaining applications, I think some six or seven have been granted. Now, what I should like to have if possible is an enunciation of the principles upon which the merger should be allowed. What is meant by this vague term "in the public interest?" For instance, I understand that the Bank of Hamilton sought to merge with some other bank, but the application was refused on the ground that it was not "in the public interest." Surely there should be some limitation to that very wide and vague term which means something to everybody and nothing to anybody in particular. It is like the phrase "adequate protection" which covers—

Mr. FIELDING: A multitude of sins.

Mr. SHAW: Yes, it covers a multitude of sins.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid that if my hon. friend were asked to suggest what conditions could be laid down he would have as much difficulty as I have in the matter. If it were a case of two large banks where the amalgamation involved a diminution, a material diminution, in competition it might be held there is no particularly good reason for the merger except some profit-making motive; there might be no public reason which would indicate its necessity. May I suggest to my hon. friend that all applications or suggestions for mergers do not come before the public in a formal way. Ministers of Finance are approached sometimes informally and are asked what they would think of a merger, and if they give an intimation that they do not think the merger is likely to be a useful thing that would probably be the end of it and there would be no formal application. As I said a moment ago I am not anxious to promote mergers but I quite realize, and I should expect, that if, after this bill passes, there should be applications for mergers, the minister, and the government acting co-ordinately with the minister,

will decide what the circumstances call for and what ought to be refused. I really have difficulty in defining the matter more clearly than it is defined at present.

Mr. COOTE: I wonder if the minister would care to state whether he has received information already regarding further mergers in Canada or not?

Mr. FIELDING: I have no proposal before me for any merger nor do I anticipate any coming at any early date.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether in his opinion it is not in the interest of the public that there should be competition in banks as well as in all other organizations. The whole tendency is in the direction of mergers and I must say that I would look upon the movement with some degree of favour if we should see established a Bank of Canada. Such an institution would be a national bank, and more or less associated with smaller concerns. Something in that direction may be effected which would serve the interests of the public. Apparently, however, the tendency is to remove the competition that now exists in banking. Heretofore we have had a great many banks in this country serving the public, and when those desirous of getting accommodation cannot get service at one they may go to another. Still, the tendency is towards mergers, and if it continues there will not be very many banks left in the country. They will all be merged. The same thing has occurred in Great Britain. An enormous amount of merging has taken place there. I cannot say what the net result has been in Britain, but certainly there has been a great diminution in the number of banks, and the same thing is going on in many other countries. It is taking place in the United States. There have been mergers there, and especially mergers in connection with the railways. There have also been extensive mergers in Great Britain in connection with the railways. Where is this merging business going to end? We have got through a great war, and a great disturbance, and there have been many mergers and consolidations of this kind. Is it in the public interest that there should be these consolidations without having some explanation as to the underlying principles that ought to obtain in connection with mergers, especially of banks? While the minister says he has not heard anything of any likelihood of other mergers, there have been hints in the public press of other mergers coming, and coming in the city of Montreal. There may be other mergers under way which are directed from Toronto, and the public certainly have some interest in knowing what ought to be the underlying principles. Those principles, if possible, ought to be embodied in the Bank Act with which we are now dealing. I do not see why there should not be a more explicit statement by the minister not only on behalf of himself and the department but on behalf of the public, as to what the government's attitude is toward this question of bank mergers. There is rather an attitude on the part of the public that they do not know exactly what is transpiring and the extent to which these mergers are going on. If up to date they have been all right, well and good, but I do not think such is the case.

There is another thing that has transpired in connection with the revision of the Bank Act this session and that is a direct refusal to permit the creation of smaller banks. Now, in the United States, which is a country very similar to ours, they have a provision in their banking laws which allows the establishment of smaller banks ,and these banks have been of great service to particular localities. In these localities the capitalists get together and establish a small bank for the encouragement of their particular district and the local industries, and I think they have done very substantial service to the country. But we have gone so far as to say that we do not want small banks, and we are allowing mergers to go on without any direct definition of the underlying policy or principle which should govern. We have heard from members from the Maritime provinces what has happened in that particular part of Canada in regard to the disappearance of banks. One of the strongest banks in the Dominion today came from one of the Maritime provinces. The administration, for example, of the Bank of Nova Scotia—and it is one of the best and most successful administrations in Canada, has been moved from the Maritime provinces. We have heard Maritime province members say that they look with a great deal of suspicion upon the disappearance of the local banks. I do not know how many strong Maritime province banks have disappeared during the last twenty years. The present Finance Minister, and previous Ministers of Finance, could doubtless justify this, but there is a suspicion in the minds of the public that there should not be this widespread merging of banks, and that there should not be this direct refusal to grant charters to small banks without a declaration of policy by parliament. If there is one good reason why the bank charters should only be granted for one year it is because all these questions are coming up.

Before we renew the charters for ten years we should settle the underlying principle on which mergers are to be allowed. We have the refusal of parliament at this time of revision to make any proper provision for the establishment of smaller banks. I am a great believer in the success of the small banks in the United States, notwithstanding the disasters which accompanied the administration of some small banks. I challenge the proposition that it would be a good thing for Canada to have more bank mergers. Competition is a good thing for trade, as has been said by many exponents of fiscal policies. I subscribe to that doctrine.

Mr. BUREAU: How are you going to compete?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Do not merge them. Leave us what we have at least, or give us a good reason for having mergers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I thought the hon. member believed in putting all our banks together?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I said that I would not object to one large Bank of Canada, and not only one national bank, but one national reserve for all the banks, and a national system of currency, instead of the creation and widening of the principle of bank-note issue. We are now strengthening the right of the banks to issue their own notes, and they actually destroy the national notes as fast as they can get them; they put them out of business and substitute their own notes for the use of trade. We are now making the third revision of the Bank Act; we are revising it for ten years, notwithstanding the disclaimers that have been made; we are doing all this without a declaration of the underlying principle that ought to govern bank mergers, without a real declaration in regard to what we ought to do in connection with the establishment of smaller banks, and we are declaring that this revision should be for ten years. If there is anything incumbent on parliament to-day it is that they should make a declaration in regard to these matters I have mentioned. We have a report presented by another committee which states, after careful study, that they are not prepared to say what ought to be done to widen the basis of credit, as it is called and this matter has been very carefully considered by the committee on Agricultural Conditions. In view of all these things, we ought to have a care at this time, and should not grant a renewal of the bank charters for ten years without an absolute declaration as to the underlying principles in the matters of mergers. Yet we are doing this at a time when there are hints of other mergers coming. I leave it to the members from the Maritime provinces to say whether they appreciate the disappearance of all the local banks which were doing business in their provinces. The world has been turned upside down by the war, and a new alignment is now under way, and I ask whether in view of the re-adjustment that is taking place, this new alignment should be on broad progressive lines, or in the direction of a conservative movement and the consolidation of capital in very few hands. If there is to be consolidation of capital, there will soon be a political movement in this and other countries for the distribution of the power of these immense consolidations of wealth, especially in connection with the banks, because the life of trade is banking, and the life of the farmer is banking. To-day the farmer is asking for an improved banking system, something he never had before and for which he has great need. One thing he asks for is the recognition of the smaller bank; yet the mergers are proceeding. The number of banks is now down to seventeen and later on the number will be down to twelve, then ten and perhaps nine. They will centre in Montreal; perhaps many of them will centre in Toronto. I maintain that it is not a good thing. In the Mother Country there are very powerful banks that have their influence outside of London, although the concentration is all in the direction of London, as the concentration of banking in the United States is in the direction of New York. In the States however they have something which we have not got, and they dealt with it in connection with their banking act. I refer to the creation of a national reserve bank system. I am not going into the detail of that, but I have read enough, have seen enough and studied enough to realize that the American national reserve bank system is the very thing we want in Canada.

Another thing we want is to have no issue except the national note for public business. If any public representative in the United States proposed that the banks should be allowed to destroy the national notes, what we call legal tenders—put them out of business and substitute their own issue in place of these notes—he would not get a hearing, and would not be re-elected. The tendency of the banking system in Canada is to put the national notes out of existence and substitute bank notes in their place. There is some reason for this, and I suspect that there is a great advantage to the banks in it. I main-

tain that there is some reason for the action of the banks when they take away the national notes and destroy them. They are putting the legal tenders out of business so fast that we will never see them. If the banks were very anxious to issue their notes for the purpose of serving the public, I would not have any great objection, but the whole tendency of the legislation this session has been to strengthen the banks, to increase their power, to destroy the national notes and the national reserve. I challenge the Minister of Finance, and I challenge his party and the banks of this country, to say why there should be two issues of notes in Canada, a bank note and a national note, and why the banks should be given an opportunity to put the national notes out of existence and substitute their own notes. That occurs very frequently.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Carried.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is the hon. member for Halifax a merger man? Does he speak on behalf of the government? That is the issue? It is very easy to say "carried." Of course they can carry it, if that is the attitude of the party. I will give the government credit for trying to make things a little better for the country, but they have not succeeded.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Somebody had better carry out the hon. member. Call in the carrier. I repeat that it is incumbent on the Minister of Finance to say whether he approves of mergers. So far he does not disapprove. But a public man in office, when his party has to assume the responsibility of carrying on the government, must deal with these questions as they arise. This question has arisen all over the country. Great scandals have been started in connection with one merger and we have not got the explanation of it yet. We cannot get it. We cannot get the witnesses before parliament. I am not going to name the merger, but hon. members know that one of the finest banks in the country disappeared not long ago. It was a splendid bank and had customers all over the country. The bank gave these customers a good service, and in the time of war these people were let out. Probably the bank that took over this bank took over the customers. But that is not a good merger. I hope before this discussion is over—and I am quite sure it is not over just yet, and that the section will not be carried in a moment—that we will have a definition of policy in regard to mergers and a further enlightenment as to whether it is the policy of the government, now that we are revising the Bank Act for ten years, that there should be two sytems of bank reserves in this country, and two issues of notes, namely bank notes and national notes. We want a final declaration from the government whether it would not be wise for this parliament under present circumstances to renew the Bank Act for another year or for two years, in order to allow parliament to take up all these questions of mergers and revisions, even the establishment of a national bank reserve system, and in connection with that a system of credit for the farmers. They want that, and they ought to unite in order to secure it. A national bank reserve system and a system of credit for the farmers ought to be part of this policy, or you will not afford relief where relief is asked for by the people of the West. For a moment I am going to leave the discussion, in order to give my hon. friends from the Maritime provinces an opportunity to say whether they are pleased with the mergers which have taken place, and to give some of the other members of the House an opportunity to say whether they think that for ten years longer we should prevent smaller banks from getting charters on a much smaller capitalization.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I join my voice with those who have pointed out to the government the danger of permitting the continuation of mergers in this country? I have little to say as to the merits of concentration. I am not prepared to argue in favour of or against it at the present time; but the people are not at all satisfied that it is in the best interest of Canada that there should be a steady concentration of the money of the country in the hands of fewer and fewer men. The danger must be obvious to hon. gentlemen, when the control of capital is placed in the hands of private individuals who are not always actuated by the interest of the nation, but are more frequently actuated by their own gain. I think I may speak at any rate for my own constituents when I say that they are absolutely opposed, possibly for their own reasons, to the continuation of mergers in this country.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not think mergers can be stopped. I think the attitude of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is correct in this regard. At the same time, I do not think they should be encouraged for their own sake. Mergers are merely a passing phase of the economic system. I look forward to a time when they will be merged to the uttermost. Then, perhaps, we shall discover how to decentralize them in the interest of the people. I hope that before the next bank revision, we

shall have only one bank in Canada and one financial king upon the throne. Then, perhaps, we shall be in a position to do something better. Therefore, I hope the Minister of Finance will encourage as much as he possibly can the growing tendency to merge.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): We are dealing with a clause relating to the purchase of the assets of a bank. People designate this as a "merger," and this word has been made unpopular, being often unfairly and improperly used. Hon. gentlemen talk about a merger as if it were a thing that could be prevented. The Minister of Finance has stated the government's policy, which is a sound one, namely, that it is not disposed to consent to the merging of banks each of which occupies a sound position merely for the sake of their being merged or for the sake of profit-making. But we must have in this act some provision whereby a bank may purchase the assets of another bank. Most mergers that have taken place in Canada were induced by the fact that the selling bank was in, or approaching, an insolvent position and the management were not disposed to carry on business further. It is in the interest of depositors and shareholders that there be a legal procedure to dispose of the assets of one bank to another. There could be only one other procedure for a bank approaching insolvency to adopt, and that would be to wind up; and it is preferable to give such a bank an opportunity of disposing of its assets under favourable terms to a bank already in existence. It would be a great mistake on the part of parliament to prevent that from being done. Further, I should like to point out that a bank cannot continue right up to a position of insolvency as an ordinary business concern might do. The slightest intimation of a weak position by a bank is the sign for withdrawal of deposits, and loss of credit, which mean the destruction of the bank. Personally, I have never been able to understand the criticism which has been directed against the merging of banks. Of course, we all believe that banks which occupy a strong solvent position should not be permitted to merge. When their solvency is threatened, when their business is on the decline and is bound to end some time, they should have the right under the law to merge with other banks.

Section agreed to.

On section 101—Agreement of sale to be submitted to selling shareholders at meeting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I might say a word or two anent the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Maclean), as this clause has to do with the carrying out of provisions of sale. My conception of the position is this. The attitude of the government against the merging of banks, while not obdurate and not absolutely antagonistic, should be just as close to that as there is any possibility of getting. I do not think it is right that there should go out word that as soon as a bank feels itself to be approaching insolvency, it can apply for and obtain consent to a merger. There might be conditions under which insolvency would be the best course. It is conceivable that a bank might bring itself into, at least, a seeming position of approaching insolvency in order that merging might result. But, even if it does not do that, the utmost resistance should generally be given against a merger until it is found to be absolutely impossible to do anything else, short of definite insolvency. I believe that was the attitude of the late Minister of Finance. I know representations were made that the descent to insolvency had commenced, where still resistance was given, and where finally there was no merger because there was no consent, and at the same time there was no insolvency I do not say that the directors, in the case I have in mind, were insincere in their representations that merging was absolutely necessary; but I know the resistance was successful in preventing a merger, and that the trend of events did not finally reach insolvency.

What I want to say is this. In my judgment, the fewer mergers we have the better, that is, of the banks that we have to-day My information is that in England they have fewer than we have in Canada, although they have a much larger population. Of course they have a somewhat different system. But the fewer we have the better, and the more adverse the attitude of the government and the Minister of Finance is towards mergers, the better for us. At the same time I quite admit that the hon. member who has just sat down is correct when he says that there comes a time when merging is the only way that can prevent very great hardship to shareholders or possible loss to depositors—in a word, to prevent the very things which the safeguards of the Bank Act are intended to prevent. But it should be the last resort, and the very last resort; and the bank should understand that such is the attitude of the government. It should understand that it is only as a rescue from inevitable insolvency that a merger can be assented to. I can think now of no other justifiable case.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would add just a word or two after what the right hon.

gentleman has said. There should, I think, be some provision in the Bank Act to obviate the necessity for any banks approaching insolvency, which is the very thing complained about now. Probably the best safeguard against such a condition would lie in still more stringent regulations under the act. After some little observation of bank mergers in this country I have come to the conclusion that provision should be made in the act for an earlier examination into the condition of banks. Most of the mergers that have taken place ought to have been known either directly or indirectly to the Deputy Minister of Finance who, not by any public examination but by an examination of some sort, should have a way of finding out a year or two ahead the exact state of affairs in connection with the banks in order to prevent the things that lead to insolvency. As it is, we have no such provision. That is one reason why the Bank Act should be extended for only one year, so that at another session of parliament we might deal with this question, which is associated with the creation of a national reserve bank system and a system of credit for the convenience of farmers.

Mr. FIELDING: With most of what my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) said regarding mergers I am heartily in accord. But he was perhaps too rigid in his statement that a merger should be allowed only when a bank could prove that it was on the eve of insolvency. That, I think, is too strong a statement to make. I have in mind the case of a merger which is not by any means recent having occurred some years ago, in connection with which the bank that was absorbed was entirely solvent when turned over to the other bank—it was not insolvent, nor indeed was it on the edge of insolvency. The directors, capable business men, reviewing the whole situation, saw however that the bank was on the decline, and that the day was coming when it could not be successful. They realized that if they persevered their shareholders would lose money, and in good time, before insolvency was absolutely in sight, they asked for a merger. I
4 p.m. do not know who was Minister of Finance at the time, I do not believe it was in my day; but they got permission and the merger took place. I am not dissenting from what my right hon. friend has said, but I would not suggest that a bank should prove that it was absolutely insolvent before being allowed a merger. The whole situation should be reviewed from the point of view of not desiring mergers; but at the same time you do not want to sacrifice any existing institutions or destroy the property of shareholders if by allowing a merger in time you can safeguard that property.

Section agreed to.

On section 107—Further conditions.

Mr. KELLNER: Has any effort been made to withdraw the notes of the Merchants Bank which are in circulation?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not quite aware whether any special arrangement has been made to have them withdrawn, but they are as good as the wheat, there can be no objection to them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): They certainly are not good to eat.

Mr. FIELDING: The notes of the Merchants Bank are as good as those of any other bank because the Bank of Montreal has agreed to redeem them.

Mr. KELLNER: I was not questioning the validity of the notes, I simply wanted to know what was the policy of the government in a case of that kind. Is it the government's policy to let such notes circulate until they are all finally in?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): As they are presented they will be redeemed. I do not suppose there are many of them in circulation now.

Mr. KELLNER: I understood it used to be the function of the Merchants Bank to cancel them.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): They will now be presented to the Bank of Montreal.

Section agreed to.

On schedule G.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to ask the minister for a little information on this schedule. I refer to paragraph 2, "Balance due to Dominion government after deducting advances for credits, pay-lists, etc." I would like to ask the minister what method is used in his department in allocating deposits to the different banks. Or, is there any such method?

Mr. FIELDING: There is no special rule in the matter. The chief banker of the government is the Bank of Montreal, but we have more or less business with all the banks of Canada. Sometimes the convenience of the various departments in making their deposits influences the matter.

Mr. COOTE: Are advances under the Finance Act shown in this column at the present time? I am referring to the return for February 28th which was posted in the first report of the standing committee on Banking and Commerce. It shows a total balance due the Dominion government of $32,000,000. Does this include advances to the bank under the Finance Act?

Mr. FIELDING: My recollection is that the advances under the Finance Act would come under the list of securities and not be included in that item.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It would appear under paragraph 3 of the liabilities.

Mr. COOTE: It just struck me as being rather significant—that one bank is shown in this return to have $10,832,000 of a balance due the Dominion government out of a total balance due the Dominion government of $32,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING: In the new form of return there is a special item showing advances under the Finance Act.

Mr. COOTE: Could the minister tell me whether this includes such advances?

Mr. FIELDING: I think not. My impression is they would appear under a different heading, but hereafter they will have a special heading of their own.

Mr. COOTE: Just what is meant by item No. 11 under Liabilities, "Bills payable." The total shown in this return under that heading is $10,364,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Bills payable to the Dominion government?

Mr. COOTE: I do not know whom these bills are payable to. I would like a little information from the minister.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If those are the bank returns that my hon. friend is quoting from, that means bills payable by other banks and by the public, I presume.

Mr. COOTE: This is under "Liabilities."

Mr. HANSON: It is a matter of acceptances on the part of the bank.

Mr. FIELDING: There might be bills payable on both sides of the account. The bank might have in its liabilities certain outstanding bills.

Mr. COOTE: It seems to me rather significant that the total of bills payable by Canadian banks is $10,364,000 and of this amount one bank has $7,773,000. Could the minister give me any explanation of that?

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: That is under "Liabilities?"

Mr. COOTE: Yes, item No. 11.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is item No. 12 in the amended bill.

Mr. FIELDING: The return shows the liabilities of the bank to all creditors, and the banks might have bills payable to other banks. This does not refer to the government at all. It refers to the ordinary transactions between the banks and the public.

Mr. COOTE. Then might I refer to Item No. 10 "Due to banks and banking correspondents elsewhere than in Canada and the United Kingdom." This return shows a total borrowing by Canadian banks from outside banks of $34,000,000, and of this amount one bank has $16,000,000. Can the minister give us any explanation of why one of our Canadian banks should have such a large amount borrowed from the other banks?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not give my hon. friend any explanation without inquiry from the bank. It is a matter between the banks themselves. It is not a matter between the bank and the government. These are the ordinary commercial transactions.

Mr. COOTE: I just wondered if it had been drawn to the minister's attention by any officer in his department. This is a very large amount for any bank to have under that heading.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I might be able to offer a word of explanation. That item includes all the amounts which the correspondents of the bank have on deposit. Take a foreign bank: it will have sums on deposit in Toronto, Montreal and all through this country, and the Canadian bank has to show those sums on deposit under Item No. 11 "Due to banks and banking correspondents elsewhere than in Canada and the United Kingdom." Every deposit that a bank has from any correspondent is put under this item. It does not represent borrowing at all.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: May I remark that an hon. gentleman who differs from us with regard to this bill has intimated, as they have been kind enough to facilitate the passing of the bill to-day, that they want it to be understood that on the third reading they will propose four amendments. It is expected they will not be debatable but they want to have recorded votes upon them. It may be

as well understood that when the third reading is called that is what is expected by way of procedure.

Mr. HANSON: When will the third reading be?

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps to-morrow. If not, the next day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I understood the minister aright. He said that he anticipated on the third reading there would be four amendments and that they would not be debatable.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say they would not be debatable. The hon. gentleman who gave us notice of them said that his expectation was they would not be debated. Of course, they are all debatable. I understood that it was not their intention to debate them, however, but they wanted their votes recorded. Every one of them, of course, is debatable.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish simply to place my position before this committee. If hon. gentlemen opposite or hon. gentlemen to my right take it upon themselves to debate these amendments I shall reserve the right to myself of reply.

Mr. FIELDING: Anybody can cause a debate who moves an amendment.

Bill reported, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask the Minister of Finance what time to-morrow the third reading will be taken?

Mr. FIELDING: If it is brought up to-morrow it will be the first order.

Mr. GOOD: In the afternoon?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to express the hope—I do not put it in the form of a request because I have nothing to back the request with—that the Bank bill will not be called, in that case, until next week. I do so merely for a personal reason; I should like to be present when the amendments are moved and the vote recorded on each one. However, that is not a sufficient reason for making a request.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not sure but that it might be convenient to myself not to proceed with it to-morrow. I do not see any reason why it could not be understood that it would be made the first order for Monday. I would be quite content with that, only the quicker the better. In view of the suggestion —I will not call it a request—made by the right hon. gentleman, I am content that we should make the third reading the first order for next Monday. That is ample notice.

Mr. GOOD: Monday is election day in Ontario and a good many Ontario members will be away.

Mr. FIELDING: What is my hon. friend's suggestion?

Mr. GOOD: I say Monday is election day in Ontario and a great many Ontario members will be absent. It would be a very unfortunate day to choose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As far as I am concerned I am quite prepared to go on with the third reading now.

Mr. FIELDING: Would hon. gentlemen opposite be content to proceed now?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Very good. Then Mr. Speaker, by consent of the House I ask for the third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent, Mr. Fielding moves, seconded by Mr. Motherwell, that Bill No. 83, an Act respecting banks and banking, be now read a third time. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. GOOD: I beg to move in amendment as follows:

> That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> That Bill 83 be not now read a third time but that it he referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions that subsection 1 of section 5 of said bill be amended by substituting the word "twenty-four" for the word "thirty-three" in the fourth line thereof, and that subsection 2 of said section be amended by substituting the word "twenty-four" for the word "thirty-three" in the third line thereof.

I have a few remarks to make in that connection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is the seconder?

Mr. GOOD: The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey). I had intended some days ago speaking at some length on the situation that presents itself in connection with the revision of the Bank Act, and the granting of bank charters for a period of ten years; but I have concluded, after seeing the way things have been going during the last day or two, that it would be useless and inexpedient to speak of any of the matters I had in mind. I shall take another opportunity elsewhere to put myself on record.

Now, the substance of the amendment has already been debated in Committee of the

Whole and therefore there is no need at present to cover the ground again. But I should just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment this matter, and the fundamental questions which are involved, have not been given any adequate consideration in the committee on Banking and Commerce. The economic situation in Canada is admittedly very serious at the present time, and that fact, together with all the circumstances which were outlined the other day in Committee of the Whole makes it highly desirable that the bank charters be not extended for the full period of ten years. Of course, if it is generally understood, as has been to some extent intimated, that the Bank Act is open for revision at any time, that may be satisfactory; but it has not, I think, been clearly and definitely so understood, and for the purpose of clearing up what has been left in a rather indeterminate condition I think this amendment is necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been, perhaps, a good deal of feeling in the committee over some of the proceedings. I have personally felt that investigation, very necessary investigation, has been stifled. I have felt that at times very necessary discussion has been choked off, or that an attempt has been made to choke it off. I want to say further that the opposition to the course which has been taken by a number of the Progressive members has seemed to me to be entirely unworthy of those concerned. In that connection, and in conclusion—for I do not wish to speak at length—I want to refer to an editorial which appeared in the Montreal Standard of 9th June, which was referred to yesterday, but not read, by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). I should like to submit this editorial to the judgment of the House as the sort of thing which we ought not to have in discussions on any public question. I think, Mr. Speaker, I am in order in reading this editorial or a part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member will find that according to paragraph 202 of Beauchesne's parliamentary rules and forms:

> It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

The hon. member will find that this is supported by Bourinot, page 336.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, referring to the point of order, it seems to me that if you give the interpretation you seem inclined to give, it would cut out the reading of comment in any newspaper upon the proceedings of this House, or on any matter that is being dealt with here. I must confess I do not quite understand the rule. There is nothing in this editorial that reflects especially upon the integrity of any particular member so far as I know. It is simply comment such as we see continually in the public press upon the proceedings in this House.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does it reflect upon some hon. gentlemen who are in the House?

Mr. GOOD: Not by name.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does it insinuate something in regard to them? If not, perhaps it would be in order.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Perhaps the article was written by a humourist and therefore should not be regarded as serious.

Mr. GOOD: Do you rule me out of order in advance, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am simply directing the attention of the hon. member to the pitfall. I do not know what the contents of the article are or the subject to which it refers. If the hon. member will give the gist of the editorial to the House, I might be in a better position to rule as to its admissibility.

Mr. GOOD: I would be very glad, Sir, if you would give me permission to read the editorial and you could stop me if at any time you thought I should be stopped.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Go on.

Mr. GOOD: The editorial, only part of which I shall read is as follows:

> Time to digest the evidence—

This has reference to the position which the Progressives had taken in asking for more time to consider the evidence placed before the committee.

> Time to digest the evidence is obviously a ruse, because one part of the evidence is indigestible save by progressive gastric juices and the other part formed a lump in their stomachs long ago. It is this lump, rejected by commonsense and good business, which gives rise to all their windy futilities in committee and in the House. The evidence has been chewed and rechewed by the paper money theorists time and again and any further chewing will not make it taste or smell better.
>
> The brethren from the West, who are bent on turning the banks inside out for their own benefit, are in no hurry to get home. They can make more money at Ottawa. It takes a lot of wheat to equal $4,000, almost all of it net profit and no particular toil involved.

I will omit a few sentences referring to two of the members of the committee by name. The editorial continues:

> Of course there is no danger of the government being defeated by the Progressives. They are not

anxious for an election which would lead them into the wilderness, and no doubt the boldest held their breath when the government squeezed through with a majority of eight on the budget. But their pose is in peril and a display of firmness on the part of all the sound thinkers in the House will soon bring them to terms. We can also depend on the hot weather to take the starch out of their souls and the stiffening out of their necks.

Such being the case it looks as if Liberals and Conservatives could not do better than bury the hatchet for the nonce get together on a non-partisan measure—as the Bank Act is and press it to a vote. What the Progressives might think about it is comparatively unimportant, but it is important that this land of Canada should have a sound banking system.

I hope my reading of the editorial does not transgress the rules of the House. I just wanted to cite this as a sample of the sort of opposition which we sometimes have to meet, but I am not greatly worried over this kind of opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a misunderstanding. I thought it proper to let the hon. member read the gist or the substance of the editorial to the House. As a matter of fact it is out of order, because it has no bearing on the present amendment moved by the hon. member, but I must say that what the hon. member has just read might be the subject of a question of privilege, because it contains a reference to some hon. members of the House, but it has no bearing on the present amendment.

Mr. GOOD: I am not as familiar with the rules of the House as I would like to be, and if this particular matter should have been referred to under another heading, I must, of course, apologize for bringing it up in this connection. I submit, however, that it has a very distinct relevance to the question under discussion, because the amendment is for a reference of the bill back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions as to the amending of clause 5, and the editorial which I have read seems to me to have specific reference to the amendment which I have just moved in that it refers to our claim made hitherto, as to the need for further time for considering this question. However, I do not think there is any need at the present time to prolong the discussion on this matter. It received a good deal of ventilation in the Committee of the Whole the other day, and I presume every one here has made up his mind in regard to it; so that I shall say no more.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before the question is put, I want to put, in a word or two, the reasons for my vote. I cannot review to any advantage what the hon. mover of the amendment has said. I was not a member of the committee and I do not know personally of its conduct. He charges that there was a stifling of discussion and blocking in that committee. I hope the allegation is not correct; I would be sorry to think it was correct as against the Chairman, or indeed against the majority of those present. But, remembering that it was not long since I was charged with being a stifler and a blocker myself, I want to be charitable to those who, the assailants of that day, are now charged with the same offence. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that you did not enforce the rule by prohibiting the reading of the editorial, because I remember that that rule has been always more honoured in the breach than in the observance. In fact, I can recall the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), at a very recent date, quoting the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal Gazette in support of the theory that he made a very excellent budget speech; consequently I am glad it was not enforced on this occasion against the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). As to the allegations in the editorial about Liberals and Conservatives getting together in order to defeat the Progressives, I have to say that I am unmoved. I purpose to take my position on this clause on the same principles I endeavour to apply with regard to all public questions, that is on my judgment of its merits. From that judgment I do not intend to be swayed either by the adhesion of a proselyte or by the antagonism of a foe. The question is whether the act should be extended for ten years or only for one. To commence with, unless there is strong reason to the contrary, it is, of course, presumable that it is better to extend it for ten years. If one-year extensions would serve the purpose of the country generally speaking as well as ten, it is presumable that they would have been adopted long ago.

It does not take any reflection to convince one that one-year extensions would not be favourable to the conduct of public business. I do not know how public business could be carried on if there was a sword of suspension hanging over the whole financial fabric of the nation that might be brought down every twelve months—

Mr. GOOD: May I ask a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. GOOD: Does the hon. member understand the amendment to mean that the charters shall be granted year by year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I was merely saying that it was presumable that, unless there were strong reasons to the contrary, it was better

for public business that the extension be for ten years, and I fortify that by saying that otherwise it would have been the practice of this parliament to grant yearly extensions. The reason yearly extensions are not granted is because, under yearly extensions, anything in the nature of stability and continuity of business would be impossible.

But hon. members say, here is a special case, and there should now be only a yearly extension for this one time. I listened to arguments the other day in support of that contention. As I grasped them—and I may not have succeeded in getting them all, or perhaps in getting any of them right, although I listened to four or five speeches—they may be summarized as follows: First, that there is in contemplation on the part of those who favour the amendment and, perhaps, generally, certain legislation looking to the establishment of rural credit banks or some other system that will take care of the demand for loans now not capable of being met by either the loan companies or the banks, and that if when it comes to the point of considering such legislation, we are confronted with a definite ten-year extension of the Bank Act, we shall not be in favourable circumstances to establish this competing institution. I have stated this in the best terms I can. Stated in that way, I do not see any force to it. Wherein will conditions be unfavourable for its establishment, conditions that would be favourable if there was an extension for only one year? One hon. member suggested that the funds would be in the financial control, as he expressed it, in the hands, of the banks. Any funds in the banks at that time are withdrawable at once or on very short notice, and if depositors, the owners of the funds, wish to transfer them to the new institution, I do not know what would stand in their way, nor do I know of anything that would stand in their way that would not likewise stand in their way if a yearly instead of ten year extension were given. What is meant by "financial control?" There has to be somebody in control of our banks, but there would be just the same control on a one-year as on a ten-year extension. I do not know whether I grasp the argument as sought to be presented. Perhaps I do not. It really does not strike me as being capable of expression in a plausible way at all.

But it was said, if at that time the heads of our banking institutions find themselves secure behind a ten-year extension, they will not be disposed to come to parliament and to give the assistance that might be expected of them towards the working out of legislation for a rural credit system. This is more plausible, but I do not think it has force. For myself, I do not like to think the establishment of a rural credit system would at any time depend upon the assistance it would get from those who are now responsible for our chartered banks. I think it will have to get its inspiration and its support mainly from other sources. I do not think it will be wanting in either inspiration or support because the established institutions do not look with favour on it. It seems to me that we shall be just as well equipped a year from now as we are to-day or a year from now as we would be in ten, though there is an extension for ten years. I think the management of the banks will give us what is their opinion at that time, nowithstanding the fact that they have a ten-year extension; but as managers of going institutions that have been established for a long time, their opinions will naturally, and conscientiously, be formed in the atmosphere of those institutions, and they will not be favourable to something which is in the nature of an intrusion.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In the case of the establishment of a rural credit system, if the banks were unfavourable, where would the right hon. member suggest that we could get the money from?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think a rural credit system will ever be established on the basis of a forced extraction of money from the banks. It could not be established on that basis. Consequently, it will not matter at all whether the answer to the hon. member's question is, "yea" or, "nay." In a word, so far as money is going to be necessary for rural credits, the will of the owner of the money will have to be brought into a favourable state of mind to apply the money to that purpose and towards that institution.

Mr. IRVINE: Would the right hon. gentleman be prepared to admit that if the bank charters had not been extended for ten years, the bankers would be more likely to take a co-operative attitude with a rural credit system, in the way of supplying the requirements?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that will make a bit of difference to them. I do not expect they will be in a co-operative attitude at any time; I do not think the rural credit system depends upon that at all, it depends upon the soundness of the priciples on which it is worked out. One of those principles can never be the compulsory taking of money from banks or from any individuals whatsoever.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Who suggested the compulsory taking of any money from the banks?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). He wanted to know where we were going to get the money from if the banks' charter were extended. The question has no meaning unless it is intended to get the money by compulsorily taking it from the banks.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not think that inference is fair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know, then, what the intention was.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): In the United States they have made the national reserve bank system, every bank, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury—as a matter of fact, the whole banking system of the United States—a part of the rural credit system. It might be necessary to do so. I shall have something to say later, but I am just intervening to say that, so to speak, this is a part of the national banking system of the United States to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says that the national banking system was under some compulsion to the reserve banks. Undoubtedly. I do not know that it was under any compulsion to the rural credit system.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes, it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is. I do not pretend to have very recent knowledge at hand, but at one time I went pretty thoroughly into the question. I do not think the rural credit system of the United States rests in any degree at all upon compulsory contribution of banks. If that could be established, there would be some force in the observations of some hon. gentlemen who have argued in favour of the amendments. I fancy I have reviewed all that has been argued in favour of the amendment, save one observation which had to do with another sphere of the discussion altogether. It was stated that there was this overdue investigation into the conduct of certain officers of one of our banks, the Merchants Bank, and that the extension should be temporary as a lever to make certain investigations. Again I do not see the force of the lever. I do not see how a temporary or a ten-year extension has anything to do with bringing about, or deferring, or squelching, an investigation. It does not appear to me that the objects sought to be gained, though they may be valuable, will be in the least prejudiced by the ten-year extension. Very well, unless there is a forcible reason, one is not justified in voting for a one-year extension. This has been a pretty barren session, but I do not want to contribute to make it more barren than it appears likely to result now. If we have a one-year extension, we have to go over all the work that this committee went through this year. We shall likely have plenty to do next session without that. From what I have learned of the committee, I believe it certainly went very laboriously and, I am disposed to think, pretty thoroughly about its task. Do we want to face next session with the whole thing to be reviewed once more? If we do, it means just that much less attention next session to other business that is going to demand all the time of hon. members of this House. Besides, it is undoubtedly correct—and I would not do justice to myself if I did not say it—that anything in the nature of a twelve-months' extension at this period in our commercial history, when a strain is being felt everywhere, would result in an instability and a sense of insecurity, the reflex action of which would come right back upon the borrowing public of the country. Of that there seems to my mind to be no reasonable or logical doubt whatever. Consequently, I feel like voting against the amendment and in support of the clause as it stands.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): Mr Speaker—

Mr. RINFRET: Have you anything new to say?

Mr. COOTE: Yes, I assure the hon. member that I shall have something new to say before I am through. I had no intention of speaking on this occasion, but the remarks of the leader of the Opposition necessitate my rising. I regret that the right hon. gentleman was not a member of the committee on Banking and Commerce so that he could have seen just how the inquiry was conducted. I understood him to say that he thought we had gone into the matter thoroughly. Well, I may observe that we went into the matter as thoroughly as we were allowed to do. In the subcommittee of the committee on Banking and Commerce, which was charged with the duty of calling witnesses, an application was made at its first meeting, I think, to have Mr. Macarow of the Merchants Bank called to give evidence. That application was refused.

Mr. MITCHELL: If the hon. member will permit me, I might inform the House that Mr. Macarow's name was not suggested at the first meeting. It was suggested subse-

quently and the committee decided to postpone the decision as to whether or not he should be called. The subcommittee did not meet again and the matter was dealt with by the general committee.

Mr. COOTE: In that case I am corrected by the hon. member. At any rate, the fact remains that the application to have this gentleman called was refused. That subcommittee also recommended that Mr. Baker be requested to give evidence before the committee, but Mr. Baker did not appear. Later on it was moved in the committee by one hon. member that this gentleman should be summoned to give evidence; the committee voted that proposition down and we were not allowed to have the benefit of Mr. Baker's evidence. Sir John Aird and Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor both appeared before the committee and if I remember correctly on both occasions the chairman of the committee gave the assurance that these gentlemen would be back again. The questioning of these witnesses was largely in regard to the investigation, in connection with the motion of the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine), into the basis of credit, and not very generally in regard to the Bank Act as it was presented to us. Later on in the committee I moved that these gentlemen be recalled with the particular purpose in view of securing some details of the cost of running their western branches, in view of the statement they had made that they could not carry on under a maximum rate of interest of 7 per cent. This request was rejected by the committee, although, as I say, we had the assurance of the chairman previously given that the witnesses would be before the committee again. It was also moved that a witness should be called who was familiar with the operations of the federal reserve bank system in the United States, something entirely new within the last ten years. The committee, I think, took a very unreasonable attitude and absolutely refused to call any witness, although I believe that in the revision of the Bank Act ten years ago several bankers from the United States were called, and that at a time when the federal reserve system was not yet in existence in the United States.

The principal question, it seems to me, has not been touched upon, and that is the very serious situation that exists to-day in the banking business of Canada, and the utter inadequacy of the present Bank Act to deal with that situation. I made the further request that a statement be called for from the banks of Canada showing their losses by provinces during the last two years. The question did not come to a formal vote in the committee. I was requested by several members not to press the motion because it would not be wise to do so, that if the losses were made known they might be so large as to shake the confidence of the public in our banks. I yielded to that view. But if that is the case I do contend that the present act, as we have passed it through the committee to-day, is totally inadequate to deal with the situation.

Before I sit down I want to say something new for the benefit of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Rinfret). Has that hon. gentleman heard that a certain chartered bank in Canada has borrowed to the extent of quite a few million dollars from the firm of J. P. Morgan & Company of New York? If so, does he think that such a situation in Canada, which is brought about under the present Bank Act—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What has that to do with your motion? What is wrong with the borrowing?

Mr. COOTE: I wanted to introduce something new for the benefit of the hon. member.

Mr. FIELDING: It should be something relevant.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It should be something relevant and sensible.

Mr. COOTE: The bankers told the committee that they had plenty of money to loan, but I am told that the conditions are such as are suggested by the statement I have made. I do not know as to the accuracy of this report, of course, but it is possible that if the committee had carried on its investigation as fully as we wished they might have found that what I have stated is substantially true. Now, I do not think that the situation in Canada is so good as to warrant the hasty passage of this act. As was pointed out on a former occasion by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird), our banks carried on business from 1910 to 1913 under a charter which was renewed yearly and I never heard that there was any feeling of insecurity at that time on that account.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Just as the leader of the Opposition sat down I was about to rise to explain in a word what I had in mind when I asked the question I did while he was speaking. It was not my thought that any force should be applied to the banks in order that they should help any rural credit scheme. But, as I understand it, under present conditions the banks have very largely a monopoly of the

deposits which are made by the people throughout the country, and if this rural credit scheme would in any way tend to take these deposits from the banks I am quite sure there would be a decided opposition, as there has been in some of the provinces which have attempted to establish rural credits; and there might very well be an objection that there was more or less an infringement on the recognized rights of the banks. Further, there is the question of currency. The banks have the right to issue currency, and they are the only institution outside the government that have that right. It is quite conceivable that if a rural credit scheme were put forward it might be necessary to issue some other kind of currency than we have at the present time. I can understand that we might, in that connection, be met with the argument of certain vested interests; but more important than even that is the question of the giving of credit. It was said again and again during the course of the investigation that the giving of long-term credits was not a part of legitimate banking business, but I cannot see how we can arbitrarily distinguish between the kinds of credits that may be given. When it is urged that we should have short-term credits or that we should have only those kinds of credits that can be readily cared for by the banks, I can see that there may be very considerable danger of invading the province which the banks have claimed for themselves. By this act we are granting certain privileges to these institutions which, if we later attempt to introduce something like a rural credit scheme, may be found to be seriously infringed upon. That is what I had in view when I asked the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) where the money would come from if it should be found wise to introduce some such scheme in the near future.

5 p.m.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, while I am in sympathy with the motion, I am an absolute believer in the supremacy of parliament in the matter of legislation; in the right of parliament to change the Bank Act or any other act at any time. I may add that we shall be forced to change the Bank Act, in my opinion, at a very much earlier day than ten years from now, having regard to the circumstances that are developing. So I am here to vote for this limitation in order to allow parliament to deal with the question, but I point out that we have the right to reopen it at any time—the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has stated it; the chairman of the Banking committee (Mr. Maclean, Halifax), has stated it. Parliament has the supreme right to reopen any question, notwithstanding any limitation that may be imposed at this time. The Criminal Code can be amended at any time; so can the Railway Act. But privilege is coming forward and saying that there shall be an amendment to the Bank Act only once in ten years. Well, that is not in the British North America Act; that has not formed part of the parliamentary policy of free people, of people subject to the democratic and the progressive rule that we have here and that they have in the Mother Country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the hon. members of the committee generally will, I am sure, agree with me in this view. We are giving now the greatest privilege that can be given in connection with our financial institutions, and while I agree that there should be stability I object to its being stated here to-day that a privilege should be created for the banks of this country for a period of ten years and should not be interfered with during that time.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Good, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Bird,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Coote,
Davies,
Evans,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Gardiner (Bow River),
Good,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
Knox,
Leader,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McTaggart,
Millar,
Reed,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—46.

NAYS

Messrs.

Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Clark,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (St. Denis),

Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dickie,
Duff,
Duncan,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Grimmer,
Hammell,
Hanson,
Hatfield,
Hughes,
Kay,
King (Kootenay),
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
McBride,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKillop,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martell,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Morrissy,
Munro,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robinson,
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Sheard,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Tobin,
Tolmie—95.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. SHAW: Last evening when the House was in committee on this bill, I proposed what occurred to me to be an effective interest rate controlling section in substitution for section 91, which is admittedly legally ineffective for the purpose for which it is intended. I do not propose to argue the question again, I will simply submit my amendment which reads as follows:

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

That Bill 83 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to committee of the whole with instructions that subsection 1 of section 91 of said bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The bank may stipulate for, take, reserve, or exact any rate of interest or discount but not exceeding 7 per cent per annum and may receive and take in advance any such rate.

(2) The rate of interest or discount charged by the bank shall appear on the face of the note, bill or other evidence of debt.

(3) In the event that a greater rate than 7 per cent per annum has been paid to the bank, then the person by whom it has been paid or his legal representative, may recover in any court the excess interest thus paid, provided such action is commenced within two years from the time such excess interest was paid.

(4) In any suit, action or other proceeding concerning a bank loan wherein it is alleged that the amount of interest paid or claimed exceeds the rate of 7 per centum per annum, the court may reopen the transaction and take an account between the parties, and may, notwithstanding any statement or settlement of account, or any contract purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, reopen any account already taken between the parties, and relieve the person under obligation to pay from payment of any sum in excess of the legal rate of interest and if any such excess has been paid, or allowed in account, by the debtor, may order the bank to repay it, and may set aside either wholly or in part, or revise, or alter, any security given in respect of the transaction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

An hon. MEMBER: No, lost on the same division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall I say lost on the same division?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. BELAND: The names will be recorded.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the sense of the House? I declare the amendment lost on the same division, with the names to be recorded.

The following is the division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Bird,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Coote,
Davies,
Evans,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy ((Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
Knox,
Leader,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McTaggart,
Millar,
Reed,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—46.

NAYS

Messrs.

Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Clark,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchène,
Delisle,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dickie,
Duff,
Duncan,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Forrester,

Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Grimmer,
Hammell,
Hanson,
Hatfield,
Hughes,
Kay,
King (Kootenay),
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
McBride,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKillop,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martell,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Morrissy,
Munro,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robinson,
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Sheard,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Tobin,
Tolmie—95.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question now is on the main motion.

Mr. COOTE: I desire to move an amendment to the main motion. The amendment is the same as the one I moved last night, and it is to the same effect as the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), excepting that the rate mentioned is 8 per cent instead of 7 per cent. I do not propose to speak on the amendment as the matter was thoroughly debated from the affirmative side last evening. The amendment reads as follows:

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

That Bill 83 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to committee of the whole with instructions that subsection 1 of section 91 of said bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The bank may stipulate for, take, reserve, or exact any rate of interest or discount but not exceeding 8 per cent per annum and may receive and take in advance any set rate.

(2) The rate of interest or discount charged by the bank shall appear on the face of the note, bill or other evidence of debt.

(3) In the event that a greater rate than 8 per cent per annum has been paid to the Bank, then the person by whom it has been paid, or his legal representative, may recover in any court the excess interest thus paid, provided such action is commenced within two years from the time such excess interest was paid.

(4) In any suit, action or other proceeding concerning a bank loan wherein it is alleged that the amount of interest paid or claimed exceeds the rate of 8 per centum per annum, the court may reopen the transaction and take an account between the parties, and may, notwithstanding any statement of settlement of account, or any contract purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, reopen any account already taken between the parties, and relieve the person under obligation to pay from payment of any sum in excess of the legal rate of interest and if any such excess has been paid, or allowed in account, by the debtor, may order the bank to repay it, and may set aside either wholly or in part, or revise, or alter, any security given in respect of the transaction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall I say lost on the same division with the names recorded? What is the sense of the House?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Coote which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Bird,
Campbell,
Coote,
Davies,
Evans,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy ((Port Arthur & Kenora),
Knox,
Leader,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McBride,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McMurray,
McTaggart,
Millar,
Neill,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—46.

NAYS

Messrs:

Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Bourassa,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Clark,
Clifford,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dickie,
Duff,
Duncan,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Grimmer,
Hammell,
Hanson,
Hatfield,
Hughes,
Kay,
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,

MacLaren,	Pelletier,
Maclean (Halifax),	Power,
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),	Prevost,
McCrea,	Putnam,
McGiverin,	Rhéaume,
McIsaac,	Rinfret,
McKillop,	Robb,
McQuarrie,	Roberge,
Marcil (Bonaventure)	Robinson,
Marcile (Bagot),	Ryckman,
Martell,	St. Père,
Meighen,	Sheard,
Mewburn,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Michaud,	Spence,
Mitchell,	Stevens,
Morrissy,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Munro,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Murdock,	Stewart (Leeds),
Murphy,	Sutherland,
Ouimet,	Tobin,
Papineau,	Tolmie—89.
Parent,	

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong unduly this very interesting series, but I have an amendment which introduces a very important subject. I may say that, in substance, it is the same amendment that I attempted to bring into the House on a previous occasion, and it deals with the matter of the Merchants Bank. Since the Bank Act was last revised, there has occurred a very vicious and cynical attack upon the principles of rectitude and integrity that are supposed to lie at the very root of our Canadian civilization, and the flagrancy of that act seems to be exceeded only by the complacency with which some hon. members in this House are prepared to see it sink into oblivion. I will content myself with reading the amendment. Some of us on this side of the House think the responsibility for pushing through this Bank Act without an inquiry into the Merchants Bank case ought not to rest upon any committee, but ought to be laid where it belongs, at the door of the House as a whole. I therefore beg to move:

That all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

"Whereas the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce decided by resolution not to hear evidence dealing with the collapse of the Merchants Bank, and its subsequent amalgamation or absorption with the Bank of Montreal;

And whereas it is in the public interest that the conditions which led to or were connected with said collapse should be made public, in order that any weaknesses or deficiencies in the existing Bank Act may be remedied, and the interests of depositors, shareholders, and the general public may be safeguarded:

And whereas it is in the public interest that the facts surrounding the said amalgamation or absorption should be made public, in order that appropriate action may be taken by parliament, to prevent improper financial combinations and undue centralization in the control of financial credit in Canada.

Therefore be it resolved that Bill No. 83 be not now read a third time, but that the said bill be referred back to the standing committee on Banking and Commerce, with instructions that it have power to call and hear evidence concerning the said collapse and the said amalgamation or absorption, and that it have power to make such recommendations in the premises as may be deemed advisable."

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, in supporting the amendment moved, I desire to take this opportunity of making a few observations, not that I for a moment am labouring under the misapprehension that whatever remarks I may make, will make the slightest impression upon the House. But I think it is only reasonable that an opportunity should be given to this House to express its views in connection with the recent collapse of the Merchants Bank and its more recent absorption by one of the strongest banks in this country. The decennial revision of the Bank Act gives us a casual opportunity, at least, of surveying the whole field of banking legislation and the whole credit field, and to observe whether or not in the preceding decade the Bank Act has really functioned in the interest of the people. It gives us at this revision period an opportunity to study and to appreciate conditions which have arisen in the intervening time, and it allows us, if we are students of the problem, to add to our experience and, perhaps, to make necessary corrections and alterations in the act itself. The outstanding incidents of the last ten years may be placed under two categories. There is first of all the fact that during that period some six mergers have taken place. There has been the merger of the Royal Bank with the Quebec, the Traders and the Northern Crown banks.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. SHAW: I shall be there just in a moment.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member should not depart from the question.

Mr. SHAW: I desire to lay the basis in a few introductory sentences for what remarks I have to make, and I ask the hon. member for Halifax to be patient with me and to listen to the facts, however unsatisfactory he may deem them. The Bank of Montreal has joined hands in the past decade with the Bank of British North America and the Merchants Bank, and the Bank of Nova Scotia has absorbed the Bank of Ottawa. That is one set of circumstances. Another circumstance is the collapse of the Merchants Bank. In connection with the collapse of the Merchants Bank, with which this particular amendment has to do, I want to give a very

short history of that institution and to observe, if possible, the place which it filled in the financial history of this country.

This bank was organized in 1864 and at the time of its collapse had 389 branches functioning in all parts of Canada, except the province of Prince Edward Island and the Yukon. It stood third among the chartered banks of Canada in respect of the number of branches. It made a special effort to minister to the agricultural requirements of the country, for we find that of its total number of branches 147 were located in the three western provinces; and in the province of Alberta it led all other chartered banks with a total of 75 branches. In this connection I would observe—because I do not want to be misunderstood—that the losses that caused the collapse of the Merchants Bank did not arise in western Canada; they clearly arose in eastern Canada.

The success of this bank is not measured by the number of its branches, because I find that in the value of its assets, according to the last statement submitted, it stood fifth among the chartered banks of Canada, with assets totalling $182,000,000. Its liabilities to the public were $161,000,000, of which amount the responsibility to its depositors totalled the not inconsiderable sum of $130,000,000. It had an unimpaired reserve, according to the figures submitted, of $9,500,000. In addition to that I might point out that this bank, for a number of years paid a dividend of 12 per cent to its shareholders, and its shares immediately prior to the collapse brought on the market $160 each. So that generally speaking it may be said, so far as the public was concerned, that the Merchants Bank of Canada has an apparent financial stability, and merited in no limited degree the public confidence and esteem which it enjoyed. Very suddenly the scene is changed. Early in December, of 1921, the president of the bank, Sir Montagu Allan, issued a statement in which he pointed out two or three rather important facts. He pointed out that there had been large losses suffered by the bank which losses had been undisclosed to the directors, and that as a result there had been a very serious impairment in the reserve. He also stated that one Mr. Mackenzie, who, I believe, was general manager of the Royal Trust Company—an institution which has been called in this House the back-door of the Bank of Montreal—had been employed for the purpose of making an audit some months before and had disclosed the particular facts to which I have alluded. Finally, the president stated that an absorption into the Bank of Montreal had been arranged, and among other details he mentioned that two Merchants Bank shares, would be exchanged for one Bank of Montreal share and the sum of $10.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was detailing the statement made by the president of the Merchants Bank in the preliminary announcement he gave to the public in December, 1921. Needless to say, an announcement of that character and made under such circumstances created considerable consternation. By the shareholders it was received with feelings of dismay, because the proposed arrangement made with the Bank of Montreal represented a loss to them alone of approximately five and a quarter millions of dollars. In addition to that it represented a very severe loss to the employees of the Merchants Bank, because the pension fund to which they were entitled and which formed part of the inducement held out to them in connection with the services they were rendering, was represented in the form of shares of that bank. After a short delay the Finance Minister of the day gave his preliminary consent to the absorption, pointing out that the only alternative was insolvency and loss. As required by law the shareholders of the Merchants Bank subsequently met, I believe, on the 8th of February for the purpose of approving the arrangement which had been entered into with the Bank of Montreal.

According to the published reports, the president of the Merchants Bank, Sir Montagu Allan, gave some further facts at that meeting. He pointed out that a firm of stockbrokers in Montreal which had become insolvent owed the Merchants Bank something like $4,500,000; that the debt of this firm to the bank had increased from $579,000 in April, 1916, to over $4,500,000 at the time of the firm's collapse in July, 1920, and that owing to the appalling inadequacy of the security and collaterals held by the bank, the bank suffered a loss of approximately $4,000,000. The president further pointed out that a debt owing by an organization called Exclusive Ladies' Wear and two or three allied organizations amounted in December, 1916, to almost a quarter of a million dollars, but that it had increased until in 1920 it stood at a total of $1,300,000. As a result of these two transactions alone the bank lost considerably

over $5,000,000. The president himself described the transactions to which I have referred as adventurous banking, but it seems to me that the amazing insufficiency of the security which was held by the bank justified the use of a very much harsher term.

By reason of these and other minor transactions the president pointed out that the bank's reserve had been reduced to meet these losses from nine and a half million dollars to one and a half million dollars. The shareholders at the meeting in question approved of the agreement and voted down a resolution that an inquiry should be conducted by the Dominion government to ascertain the responsibility for the situation which existed. It is only fair to say that the resolution was voted down not by the shareholders in person, but by reason of proxies held by the officers of the bank.

In addition to these facts mentioned by the president at that meeting to which I have referred, there were one or two other interesting facts disclosed. It was made apparent there that the Bankers' Trust Company, a subsidiary of the Merchants Bank, had in the months of October, November and December preceding the collapse sold some seven hundred shares of the bank stock at the market price then prevailing. The Bankers' Trust Company had in these sales secured the prices which prevailed for the Merchants Bank stock prior to the decrease caused by the announcement of the collapse.

Another fact disclosed was that on December 9th a committee had been appointed by the bank directors, consisting of the president, the vice-president, and I think Mr. Ballantyne, for the purpose of entering into negotiations with any bank or banks which might have a proposition to offer in connection with the sale of the Merchants Bank's assets. That, mark you, was on December 9th. It also transpired at the same meeting that on December 8th, the day preceding the Merchants Bank directors had received the offer from the Bank of Montreal which was at that meeting approved and which subsequently was carried into effect. In due course the Bank of Montreal shareholders met and approved of the arrangement. One of the officers of that bank in giving his reasons for the approval suggested that the acquisition of the Merchants Bank would give to the Bank of Montreal a number of branches in places where formerly they had very little representaton.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I interrupt my hon. friend? Is he not now discussing the merits of the merger? Let me ask him to frankly answer the question as to whether or not he is speaking to his amendment.

Mr. SHAW: If the hon. member for Halifax will read the amendment carefully he will find that it calls for an inquiry not only into the collapse of the Merchants Bank but into its subsequent absorption by the Bank of Montreal. Now surely my remarks are appropriate to the resolution.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The substance of my hon. friend's amendment is that the Bank Act be referred back to the committee with a direction that an inquiry be held into the merger of these two banks, but my hon. friend is arguing the whole thing out now himself. He is giving the committee all the facts as he has them. He is deciding the whole thing now.

Mr. SHAW: Surely my hon. friend is not going to deny that in order to justify this resolution I must present to the House some facts which would warrant action being taken on it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friend must show the relevancy between the merger and the Bank Act. He must show that it is reasonable that we have all the facts before us in order to consider the act.

Mr. SHAW: I am trying to narrate the facts as they have been disclosed, and if my hon. friend will bear with me patiently I think he will subsequently discern some relation between the facts I am giving now and the motion before the House.

When interrupted I was about to say that the final act in the drama was presented by the approval to the merger by the Minister of Finance, so that in a period of two months the threatened collapse had been translated into absorption, and the Merchants Bank with a long and honourable history had yielded up its life, and its obligations and its assets had been assumed by its historic competitor. Not only was there a genuine feeling of regret among the customers of the bank that an old and established institution should have disappeared in this manner, but there was left to mourn its loss a long list of penalized shareholders and employees. In addition I might say, Mr. Speaker, that public confidence in our much vaunted banking system was very severely shaken.

The next question to which I shall address myself is as to whether or not any inquiry of the facts has been undertaken. That has

been suggested I think by the hon. member for Halifax himself and other hon. members, and they have argued that therefore it is unnecessary that this resolution should be presented. The government was urged to take some action and finally a criminal prosecution was instituted against the president and general manager of the Merchants Bank. They were both charged with making false returns. There never was any doubt that false returns were made to the Finance Minister concerning the affairs of that bank. The only question at issue in the criminal trial was whether or not those false returns were knowingly made by Sir Montagu Allan and Mr. Macarow. That was the only issue at the trial. The facts in connection with the collapse and the facts in connection with the absorption of the Merchants Bank by the Bank of Montreal were largely immaterial to that issue and unless they related directly to the knowledge of these two individuals as to the false returns such facts were not only irrelevant but were absolutely inadmissible on the criminal trial. So I suggest that it cannot be urged with justice or with truth that the criminal prosecution of Sir Montagu Allan and of Mr. Macarow was a sufficient inquiry into the facts in connection with this particular matter. In justification of that position I would like to quote from an editorial which appeared on November 14, 1922, in the Montreal Star, a paper, I think, perhaps, not unfriendly to this government. It reads:

> It should have been realized by the government that as a rebuke—if it was intended as a rebuke—of the conduct of a section of the bank's directors, and as a deterrent to other directors, the recent prosecution were utterly inadequate and futile. If the object of the trials was to propitiate the victims and to strengthen public confidence, they have failed.
>
> A real earnest inquiry should have been made into the suspicious circumstances surrounding the bank's surrender, the sinuosities of the deal and the motives controlling the transaction.
>
> In the meantime huge expense has been incurred for the extenuated trials, and the sham claim will be set up that justice has been done to the shareholders and to public sentiment. The Merchants Bank sacrifice will live long in the minds of the people of Canada as a cowardly transaction, and the court procedures as a fiasco, while 20,000 direct sufferers, many of them distressed widows and orphans, are left to mourn without a remedy.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that so far as we have been informed the essential facts are as I have narrated. The circumstances are shrouded in considerable mystery, and as a result it is not to be wondered at that the public generally hold divergent views as to what actually took place. There are those, and there are numbers of them needless to say, who hold that this fiasco was caused by extravagance and reckless mismanagement and that the absorption was the only way out to protect the shareholders, to protect the depositors, and to protect the credit of this country.

There are others who are prepared to admit that there was gross mismanagement, but they are not prepared to admit that there was such impairment of the banks' reserves as would justify the action taken by way of absorption, and among this class of the community there was genuine indignation, I think, and genuine dismay, at the surrender of the Merchants Bank to the Bank of Montreal. There is indeed, another class who feel that there was something behind the transaction, who feel that a small section of the Merchants Bank directors—under somewhat mysterious and questionable circumstances—yielded to the desires of the Bank of Montreal and in a moment of panic, did not exercise their judgment in the best interests of their shareholders and in the best interests of the public. That phase is dealt with in the same editorial in the Montreal Star. I read it because it expresses that view much more effectively than I can. It reads:

> A transaction such as the sacrifice of the Merchants Bank, effected by a small group of its directors, while a majority of them were kept in ignorance of the scheme, bewilders the public, and the spirited condemnation of the transaction throughout the Dominion proves that there is appreciation of the extent of the mischief likely to ensue from such an avoidable calamity.
>
> The revelation regarding the Thornton, Davidson and Co.'s transaction with the Bank proves that there was bad banking and woeful error of judgment in the failure to recognize the fact that the brokerage firm was being bolstered and manipulated by dangerous men using that agency to unload worthless stocks. The Davidson loss and another bad debt were in themelves conclusive proof of the absence of discretion, but these losses, known to some of the directors for months, were no justification for the panic that led to the sacrifice.
>
> If the three directors instrumental in the surrender had taken half the pains to save the bank that they did to get it off their hands the institution would have been saved. During the past forty years many banks have found themselves in a more critical position than the Merchants Bank at the time of the sale and still were rescued by courage and fortitude on the part of their directors, and the support which they claimed and secured from the other banks and governments.
>
> Strong banks are always anxious for the stability of other institutions, and ready to help in any reasonable way to stabilize them.
>
> If the three manipulating directors had used reasonable arguments with the Finance Minister at the time to help to induce the government to get the bank over a rough spot, instead of pressing him to acquiesce without investigation in a sale he knew nothing about, and if Directors Allan, Ballantyne and Wilson had sought in a courageous way to get from the other banks the support to which they were entitled,

and which doubtless would have been given, the bank could have been continued as a promising institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the three varying views held by the people of the Dominion. Two of them must be wrong. The conclusions can only be drawn from the facts so far as they are known, and the public can not fairly be blamed for coming to an erroneous conclusion under the circumstances. I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that this House is yet fully apprized of the facts. Indeed, I am confident that the members of this House are not aware of the full facts, and the public have not yet been informed. May I, in that connection, read a statement made by Sir Edmund Walker to substantiate the view which I hold. This question was asked Sir Edmund Walker when he gave evidence before the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce:

Q. Do you agree with Sir John Aird, if I understood him correctly, that the merger should not have been allowed to take place between the Bank of Montreal and the Merchants?

A. Of course that depends on what the real condition of the Merchants Bank was, and none of us have been allowed to see that. Sir John makes that statement upon the basis of a statement made at the time by those who seemed to be in authority, that the Merchants Bank still had a surplus of about $1,000,000 odd; and his opinion was, that if it had its original capital and a surplus of $1,000,000 then it should not have been allowed to fail.

He was asked:

Q. Would you concur with him in that view?

A. I would. I would also recall the fact that the Merchants had once a capital of $9,000,000 and lost its entire reserve and $3,000,000 of its capital and began business again and succeeded. It altogether depends on what the real conditions with the Merchant's Bank were, and none of us know that.

Q. Why don't we know?

A. I don't know.

Q. Why should we not know?

A. Well, I don't know that either. I may tell you that my feelings are with the feelings of the most of the people in Canada on that subject.

He was further asked:

Q. So that so far as being a banker is concerned, you have no more sources of information than the ordinary people?

A. No, we have never been allowed to know anything more.

Q. Don't you think it is desirable that the public should know the whole history of this particular transaction?

A. Well as a fellow banker with the Bank of Montreal and the rest, I hesitate to answer that, but I may say we were all of us very indignant that we have not known more.

And then, I think, he suggested in another place that it certainly would be desirable to have the full facts disclosed. And so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if Sir Edmund Walker and Sir John Aird, bankers of the highest eminence in this country, are not apprized of the real facts in connection with the Merchants Bank disaster, and are anxious to know the facts, then surely the members of this House cannot be criticized harshly in suggesting that they too would like to know the facts in order, if possible, to make such amendments as may be necessary to repair those provisions of the Bank Act, which rendered this collapse and this merger possible.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that an effort was made in the Banking committee to have these facts disclosed, to have them thoroughly investigated. A motion was made for the purpose of calling certain witnesses who would know about these facts. That resolution, I regret to say, was voted down by the committee. In order to secure a discussion on this matter in the House, in order to get the direction of the House on this important question, a further motion was moved that the committee should report to the House the action it had taken on the previous resolution and, strange to relate, the majority of the committee refused to even present to the House the action which they had taken in that connection. Consequently by the action of the committee this House has been effectively barred from discussing the Merchants Bank matter, or the advisability of inquiring into it, until the present moment. May I say that at that time it was urged by the Minister of Finance that it was not desirable that Sir Montagu Allan and Mr. Macarow, should be tried a second time. Nobody suggested they should be tried a second time. Nobody desires they should be tried a second time. The fact that a man has been tried on a particular criminal charge does not justify this House in refusing to call witnesses to ascertain material facts in the matter, and, as I have already pointed out, these defendants would not in the slightest degree be placed in jeopardy again; they would be entitled to claim and would secure from the committee the usual right which anyone secures under such circumstances, that any evidence given by them could not, under any circumstances, be used against them in any subsequent proceedings—unless, of course, it was necessary to use it in the event of perjury having been committed.

The point is this, Mr. Speaker: Under the existing Bank Act, the Merchants Bank collapse took place. Under the existing Bank Act the merger with the Bank of Montreal took place. Surely it is not unreasonable to suggest that the facts and circumstances in connection with these two matters should be investigated thoroughly, if you want to adequately provide, as far as it is humanly pos-

sible, against similar disasters in the future. I think that is not an unreasonable position. On the other hand, I think it is entirely businesslike, and is what is expected of this parliament. In addition to that fact there can be no question that under the provisions of the Bank Act there is an increasing concentration of the credit power of this country in the hands of a decreasing number of people, and despite that fact, despite the absorption under these circumstances by the Bank of Montreal, we leave these particular sections of the act dealing with mergers in exactly the same form they were ten years ago. We have no improvements to offer, because, of course, we have not the facts upon which to base any improvement.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that we. as the trustees of the people's interest, cannot stand by indifferently and see the interest of shareholders, of depositors and even the public credit of this country imperilled. It is, if I understand it correctly, our duty and our obligation, as far as we possibly can, to prevent, by legislation, like disaster in the future Suppose, for instance, that the Bank of Montreal had not come to the rescue of the Merchants Bank, is there any one in this House who can set a limit to the disaster which would have followed? Depositors, shareholders and creditors would, alike have gone down in a crash of insolvency, and the credit of this country would have been seriously injured for years to come. Now, surely we are not going to allow, if it is possible to prevent, a creature of this parliament imperilling and placing in jeopardy the intersets of the people and the country, and rely only upon either the ambition or the generosity of a competing institution for safety. That is the suggestion which I make. For forty years in this country manufacturing industry has leaned upon parliament. Do we propose now that parliament, in order to preserve the interests of its people and preserve its own credit, shall rely upon a creature of its own creation? It seems to me that the position which we take in this matter, as designated in this resolution, is absolutely sound. The facts should be fully disclosed. In the light of these facts it may be that such legislation may be proposed as will prevent a similar unfortunate fiasco and disaster in the future.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with all the respect I desire to accord to my good friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), and to those who agree with him in this matter, I am going to submit to the House that of the many reasons that are given for the delay of this Bank Act, the weakest of all is this story about the investigation of the Merchants Bank. There is no greater delusion in the whole discussion than the allegation that the public are demanding an investigation into the Merchants Bank. There is no foundation for it in the world. There is no indication that any person who has a penny of interest in the Merchants Bank is asking for investigation, and there is no shadow of connection between the Bank Act and the Merchants Bank investigation. If you had all the investigation in the world, and produced all the results you could produce, you would not bring forth any reason against the Bank Act. Who are complaining? The failure, as you call it, of the Merchants Bank, did not involve a penny of loss to any person in the country, except the shareholders. The hon. member speaks of depositors. The depositors have not suffered any. They are not grumbling. The note holders did not suffer. They are not grumbling. The shareholders did suffer, and they are not grumbling. There is not an application from any shareholder to interfere in this matter at all. I think they have the good sense to see that by letting the matter alone they get the best results. At all events, though at the time there was some irritation, the fact to-day is that the demand for investigation into the Merchants Bank comes from people who, at all events, whatever their good motives may be, have not a penny of interest in it. There is no public interest to-day which demands an investigation into the Merchants Bank. The people who have interest in the matter have their remedy, and apparently they are content. If any shareholder of the Merchants Bank—and he is the only one affected—feels that he has been unjustly treated through the action of the directors or the neglect of the directors, or that he has suffered a penny of loss, he has his remedy in the courts of the country and knows it.

What is the use of talking about shareholders being treated badly? The institution was an unfortunate one. Why constantly talk about the mystery of the Merchants Bank? There is no mystery in the world about it. There is no transaction in public affairs better understood than the Merchants Bank affair—no mystery about it. One hon. member thought it was an extraordinary thing that the Bank Act allowed $10,000,000 to slip away between the bars. There is no mystery about a ten cent piece of the money of the Merchants Bank. They got into trouble by reckless mismanagement. They lent money without security. They lent money to a brokerage firm in Montreal and they should not have done it. They lent money to many

people, and the evidence and the whole record are there. There is no mystery about it. Everybody knows the cause of the disaster, and in a certain sense it was a disaster. Hon. members will find out that the people who are really interested are not grumbling. The world is full of idle curiosity. I suppose some persons would like to know more about it, but no public interest would be served by further investigation. Every weakness in the Bank Act that was disclosed by the Merchants Bank failure has been met and covered in the bill now before the committee. Accusations were made. The only charge that could be brought against the Merchants Bank by the government was that they had falsified the return. That accusation was made. It was sustained, so far as the department is concerned. Proceedings were taken. The trial took place. These two gentlemen who were accused were acquitted. Hon. members may have their opinions as to whether they should have been acquitted or not. What odds about that? They have been tried by the courts of the country. My hon. friends have an idea that either the Minister of Justice or the Finance Minister should have gone down to Montreal, seized Sir Montagu Allan by the scruff of the neck and taken him to prison. Those men were tried by the courts of the country and acquitted.

What more could be done? There is no mystery about it. Every penny that was lost is known to the public. The shareholders know all about it, and so far as I know they are all content—not content in the broadest sense because they have lost money, but I think they have come to the conclusion that, if things had not proceeded in that particular way, they would have lost more. I submit there is no connection between an investigation into the Merchants Bank and the bill we now have before the House. There is no reason in the world why we should delay this bill for one minute for the sake of an investigation into the Merchants Bank which could not accomplish anything and which nobody who is really interested in the bank's affairs seems to want.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): The Minister of Finance has made a very brave attempt to defend a very bad case. I had a letter the other day from a shareholder of the Merchants Bank, whom I do not know at all and never did know, who happens to be in the United States now. I am sorry I did not bring the letter down here. I have it upstairs.

An hon. MEMBER: Go and get it.

Mr. GOOD: A very irate letter indeed, endorsing, if I remember the terms of it, most emphatically the stand that we have taken in this connection. I simply offer that as a bit of evidence in refutation of the statement made by the Minister of Finance that there has been no demand from the shareholders for an investigation.

Mr. FIELDING: Is my hon. friend aware that if that shareholder has a grievance he has his remedy in the civil courts and does not need to come here at all?

Mr. GOOD: It is a small fact to which I refer, not for the purpose of attaching any great importance to it, because I do not know that the shareholders are primarily interested. I think the people of Canada are interested in this matter far more than the shareholders. The Minister of Finance says that there is no mystery about this matter. All I have to say is that if we had an investigation, we would be in a position to know. We have had no investigation into the material facts, into the really essential and vital facts of the case, I mean the facts that are important to the Canadian people. We have had an investigation into the facts of the case in so far as they relate to the specific charges that were made against the two gentlemen mentioned. But those are not the facts in which I am interested. I am not a shareholder of the Merchants Bank; but I am responsible for some of the business and the institutions of this country, and so far as my share of the responsibility goes on behalf of the Canadian people, I think this is a matter that ought to be sifted to the very bottom.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why did my hon. friend not in the month of February make a motion in parliament to grant an inquiry? Or, if he forgot this in February, why did he not make it in March? If it escaped his attention in March, why did he not do it in April? Then he had all the month of May in which to do it.

Mr. GOOD: I did what I could on the committee to have investigation made.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member should have done it in parliament.

Mr. GOOD: The facts of the case have already been presented by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). If the demand which was made in the committee for the summoning of those two or three gentlemen who were in a position to give the facts, had been acceded to, I should have been satisfied. Why did I not make a demand in parliament earlier? Well, perhaps I thought the committee was the right place, at all

events the first place where the demand should be made. The committee was instructed to revise the Bank Act, and as has been shown, this particular inquiry is entirely relevant to the revision of the Bank Act. We did what we could; I did what I could on the committee, to secure the presence of these men in order that we might get information from them. As has been already stated, we failed. On two occasions we were voted down. The committee even voted down a request that the action of the committee taken at an earlier time should be reported to the House, so that the House might then take action if it thought fit to get those men here. That was voted down also. The matter was pressed twice before the committee, and on both occasions the lid was kept screwed down. Sometimes one gets suspicious by reason of the very effort that has been made to prevent an investigation. I do not know whether there is anything wrong or not; but when an effort is made to stifle investigation, I cannot help being suspicious.

There is another aspect of this situation that I would like to mention to-night before the vote is called. I refer to the question of mergers, to the question of financial concentration. I have in my hand a book by a man who is now, I think, one of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. I refer to Louis D. Brandeis. His book is entitled "Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It." I have referred to this book on one or two occasions in the committee, and I would like to refer to it again here.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Who is Mr. Brandeis?

Mr. GOOD: He is one of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, and I gather from reading the book that he had to do with a number of investigations in the United States some years ago in regard to "big business," if I may use that expression. I may say that the book is descriptive of conditions in the United States, and I think it has a direct bearing upon the situation in Canada and upon the case which we have now under consideration. I should like to quote a paragraph which the writer quotes from a statement made by ex-President Woodrow Wilson in 1911. I read:

> The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists, our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men, who, even if their actions be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentratd upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who, necessarily, by every reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedon. This is the greatest question of all; and to this, statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men.

That was written by ex-President Woodrow Wilson in 1911. Further on in the first chapter of this book, the writer refers to the way in which the financial oligarchy in the United States extended their operations and gained control of the security makers on the one hand and the security buyers on the other—the large insurance companies and so on. I will read just one or two other extracts from this book. Here is a paragraph under the sub-heading, "Why the banks became investment bankers":

> These large profits from promotions—

He is referring to the operations of J. P. Morgan and Co.

> —underwritings and security purchases led to a revolutionary change in the conduct of our leading banking institutions. It was obvious that control by the investment bankers of the deposits in banks and trust companies was an essential element in their securing these huge profits. And the bank officers naturally asked, "Why then should not the banks and trust companies share in so profitable a field? Why should not they themselves become investment bankers too, with all the new functions incident to 'big business'?" To do so would involve a departure from the legitimate sphere of the banking business, which is the making of temporary loans to business concerns. But the temptation was irresistible. The invasion of the investment banker into the banks' field of operation was followed by a counter invasion by the banks into the realm of the investment banker.

Then he goes on to mention a number of United States banks which did this very thing.

The next chapter is entitled:

> How the combiners combine.

Further on chapter 3 is devoted to interlocking directorates, the question which was discussed in such an illuminating way last year in this House by the hon member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I want to read one or two paragraphs from this chapter. Here is the first paragraph.

> The practice of interlocking directorates is the root of many evils. It offends laws human and divine. Applied to rival corporations, it tends to the suppression of competition and to violation of the Sherman law. Applied to corporations which deal with each other, it tends to disloyalty and to violation of the fundamental law that no man can serve two masters. In either event it tends to inefficiency; for it removes incentive and destroys soundness of judgment. It is undemocratic, for it rejects the platform: "A fair field and no favours,"—substituting the pull of privilege for the push of manhood. It is the most potent instrument of the Money Trust. Break the control so exercised by the investment banker over railroads, public service and industrial corporations over banks,

life insurance and trust companies, and a long step will have been taken towards the attainment of the new freedom.

I refer now to a rather humorous specimen prospectus cited by Judge Brandeis on pages 106 and 107.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Has he chapters on the Merchants Bank failure and on the Canadian Bank Act in that book?

Mr. GOOD: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If he has not, I submit that my hon. friend should cease reading it.

Mr. GOOD: I submit that the material I have in hand is entirely relevant to the issue under consideration.

Mr. DUFF: Quite the contrary.

Mr. GOOD: This specimen prospectus is as follows, and I think perhaps it might relieve the feelings of the hon. member for Halifax if I were to read it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If it is pretty humorous and we can get away from the hymn of gloom my hon. friend is always singing, I will stand it.

Mr. GOOD: I am very glad that I shall satisfy the hon. member for once.

Mr. DUFF: That remains to be seen.

Mr. GOOD: I read the following:

A. B. & Co.
Investment Bankers

We have to-day secured substantial control of the successful machinery business heretofore conducted by..... at..... Illinois, which has been incorporated under the name of the Excelsior Manufacturing Company with a capital of $10,000,000, of which $5,000,000 is Preferred and $5,000,000 Common.

As we have a large clientele of confiding customers we were able to secure from the owners an agreement for marketing the preferred stock—we to fix a price which shall net the owners in cash $95 a share.

We offer this excellent stock to you at $100.75 per share. Our own commission or profit will be only a little over $5.00 per share, or say, $250,000 cash, besides $1,500,000 of the common stock, which we received as a bonus. This cash and stock commission we are to divide in various proportions with the following participants in the underwriting syndicate:

C.D. & Co., New York.
E.F. & Co., Boston.
L.M. & Co., Philadelphia.
I.K. & Co., New York.
O.P. & Co., Chicago.

Mr. DUFF: Where is the joke?

Mr. GOOD: If the hon. member cannot see the joke I am afraid I am unable to point it out to him. Now, there is a chapter that deals with big men and little business.

[Mr. Good.]

Mr. DUFF: I think it is little men talking about big business.

Mr. GOOD: This chapter is particularly pertinent to the situation in Canada, because there is an inevitable tendency on the part of a number of businesses of various kinds to become concentrated in the hands of a few men. The result is a growth of serious inefficiency in the operation of these businesses.

Mr. RINFRET: Is that the case with the Bank of Montreal?

Mr. DUFF: Or the Farmers Bank?

Mr. GOOD: At page 151 there appears the following quotation from ex-President Wilson:

I am not saying that all invention had been stopped by the growth of trusts, but I think it is perfectly clear that invention in many fields has been discouraged, that inventors have been prevented from reaping the full fruits of their ingenuity and industry, and that mankind has been deprived of many comforts and conveniences, as well as the opportunity of buying at lower prices.

Then Mr. Brandeis continues:

The fact that industrial monopolies arrest development is more serious even than the direct burden imposed through extortionate prices. But the most harm-bearing incident of the trusts is their promotion of financial concentration. Industrial trusts feed the money trust, practically every trust created has destroyed the financial independence of some communities and of many properties; for it has centred the financing of a large part of whole lines of business in New York, and this usually with one of a few banking houses. This is well illustrated by the Steel Trust, which is a trust of trusts.

He goes on at considerable length to show how the steel trust was formed.

Mr. DUFF: Read chapter 6, verse 4, on co-operative stores.

Mr. GOOD: I shall be glad to read it if the hon. member wants me to.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I am asking you to read it. Read chapter 6, verse 4.

Mr. GOOD: The hon. member evidently is not acquainted with the book. Chapter 10 is the one that deals with co-operation.

Mr. DUFF: Well, I made a slight mistake.

Mr. GOOD: The first two lines in the chapter read:

We must break the money trust or the money trust will break us.

That is perhaps enough on that point.

Mr. DUFF: That has nothing to do with co-operative stores.

Mr. GOOD: I have in my hand a type written document sent to a fellow-member

by a man who, I understand, lives in western Canada. This document is entitled "Canada —a Dictatorship," and in it there is an examination of the system of interlocking directorates and the concentrtaion of control of Canadian credit, industry, and so forth. I do not wish to quote from it because I have not yet had an opportunity of verifying the statements it contains, but reading it over I can see that the writer has evidently looked into the matter rather carefully. I might mention some of the headings. There are references to "The Power of the Bankers," "The Canadian Cabinet," "The Bank of Montreal," "The Grip Upon Industry," "Financial Corporations," "Fourteen Autocrats," and "A New Phase of Capitalism." I wanted to refer to this document to show that there are some Canadians who are seriously exercised over the situation in Canada, of which, I think, the absorption of the Merchants Bank by the Bank of Montreal is a typical case I mentioned the fact that Judge Brandeis gave a great deal of consideration to the matter on the other side, as have also a great many other prominent Americans. The same drift of affairs is evident on this side of the line as has been evident in the United States, and I would respectfully suggest to the House the great importance of this question and would like to impress upon hon. members the seriousness of the menace that threatens us to-day in the concentration of control in the hands of a very few men. It is not that the few who form the interlocking directorates of a number of large enterprises actually own those concerns, but

9 p.m.

they are so placed that they exercise effective control. It is pointed out in this document that one group of men in Canada pretty well control assets to the extent of about three and a half billions of dollars. I think, therefore, that I am justified in endeavouring to impress upon the House the very serious nature of the situation and the need of investigating to the very bottom this recent collapse and amalgamation so that we may know what the facts are. Probably we do not know what the extent of the danger is; nor can we know until we have ascertained the facts. Ugly rumours are afloat, and I do think that we should sift the thing to the bottom. As pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), there are two purposes in view. The first is to be able intelligently to revise the Bank Act, particularly with respect to those sections that deal with inspection and returns; and the second is to find out whether or not there have been intrigue and shady transactions in connection with this affair, as has been rumoured. I trust that the amendment will secure the support of the House.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I desire in a few words to state my reasons for the vote I shall give. I do not want to be understood as voting against any investigation into the Merchants Bank or any other episode; I always feel that if, in cases of alleged wrongdoing, the public is affected, then when a member assumes the proper responsibility for such an allegation, no investigation should be denied. And also there might be a case for investigation, were any wrongdoing alleged, if it were essential for the purposes of intelligent legislation. So the question really is: Is an investigation into this episode necessary to enable us intelligently to legislate as to the Bank Act? I have waited for argument to convince me that it is. One must consider what the public interest is in the Merchants Bank affair.

I do not quite agree with the Minister of Finance that we have no interest merely because—if it were the case—the shareholders alone were affected; it seems to me it is the duty of parliament to guard the interests of shareholders in banking legislation. But we would have an interest much wider and more direct if the depositors were so imperilled, if not actually affected by such actions as we might by legislation prevent the repetition of. Or if holders of bank notes were affected, then our interest would be still more general, more direct and more important. Now, is there reason to believe that there is something connected with the episode still undisclosed that would enable us in this act to protect better the interests of shareholders, or of depositors, or of the holders of bank notes? And there could be one more interest—the general interest of the public who do not want to see a repetition of events that end in the elimination of another bank. I know that in western Canada the case of the Merchants Bank was very widely discussed, as was the case of the Farmers Bank, and I believe the people of that country want to see every precaution taken against the recurrence of such things as result in the elimination of a bank as a separate institution.

Let me inquire again: Has it been shown, has it even been intimated, that there is anything we do not know in connection with the episode that would help us to protect the shareholders, the depositors, the note holders, or help us to prevent the repetition of the incident? If any hon. member had brought

out a tittle of evidence in support of that, there would be something substantial to discuss. The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) did read from the evidence of Sir John Aird and intimated he had read before I came in from the evidence of Sir Edmund Walker, to the effect that there were some things unknown in connection with the occurrence that led to the merger. Well, I fancy what they must have had reference to was this: They felt, and I believe the bank they were connected with felt, that up to the time of the consent to the merger there had not been disclosure to other banks that might have been just as much interested as the Bank of Montreal, of the exact situation, respecting the Merchants Bank, in order to enable those others to discuss what had taken or was to take place. I think it was felt that there had been too much confinement of the information to one single institution. It may be they had in mind that some facts were still undisclosed that they had a right to know the same as any other bank. I do not know whether they did or not; what those facts could be I do not for the life of me know.

Mr. SHAW: I suggest that that is exactly what we want to find out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, shall we postpone revision of the Bank Act simply because some witness suggests that there is something he does not know? What is it? I agree with the Minister of Finance that there were some things connected with the disaster to the Merchants Bank which would help us in the framing of this act. But were these not all brought out in the trial? What are we interested in? We are interested to see that every precaution is taken to prevent the non-disclosure to the government of Canada of vital information, of essential information connected with the management. Everything associated with that came out in the trial of these men. I wonder how many hon. gentlemen in this House have read the evidence taken at the trial? I cannot boast of having done so myself—that is to say, in the original though I have done so very carefully from more than one newspaper that reported the evidence pretty fully. So far as I could see, everything connected with that subject came out in the trial and it should have been known to the committee when the committee sat What perhaps did not come out was an answer to the question why these loans were made. Well, how in the world can this House ever legislate to prevent the making of bad loans? Hon. gentlemen say that $10,000,000 went through a hole. I suppose it did; but I can name more than one company right now through a hole in whose organization more than $10,000,000 has gone. I venture to say it would not be hard to name other banks and to point to an end of this country that might be called a hole through which $10,000,000 of the money of these banks has gone. How this can be prevented unless by making men wiser than they are I do not know. Now, everything that we are interested in is to know what precautions can be taken by parliament. All that parliament can do is to get the best information, to get all the information, required from time to time. We know that now; what other information can we ask for that is not asked for in the act? If there is any other, let us put it in. I understand that amendments have been made to the act as a result of the evidence at the trials and of the findings of the committee. Perhaps they would have been in anyway, I do not know; but I am informed that they are the result of the findings. One of them, for example, is the double audit system; another, a better definition of the responsibility of directors; another, the protection of the employees' insurance fund.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): And another, contact between the shareholders' auditors and the directors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well; I was not aware of that. The facts that affected the government, that affected the public, that affected parliament, were disclosed in these hearings. The facts that are undisclosed—if there are any, I do not know what they are—are connected with the making of a loan to a brokerage firm in Montreal that evidently should not have been made. But you may frame acts of parliament until parliament is grey and you cannot prevent bank managements from making loans that are bad. Consequently, I do not see why we should defer the passing of the Bank Act in order that there may be further investigation into this failure, or into this episode, however you may describe it. As soon as anyone can show me that by the holding of an investigation there is something to be gained in the way of light upon the Bank Act itself or how to frame it, then, whether wrong-doing is alleged or not, I will not vote against the investigation. But merely because someone says, "Well, if we fished along a bit there might be something," then I feel I would be giving a reckless, an arbitrary, an unreasoned vote in supporting delay for a year on that account.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Bird) which was negatived on the following division.

YEAS

Messrs:

Bancroft,	Leader,
Bird,	Lewis,
Campbell,	Lovie,
Coote,	Lucas,
Davies,	Maclean (York),
Elliott (Dundas),	Macphail,
Evans,	McConica,
Forke,	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Gardiner,	McTaggart,
Garland (Bow River),	Millar,
Good,	Neill,
Halbert,	Ross (Simcoe),
Hoey,	Sales,
Hopkins,	Sexsmith,
Humphrey,	Shaw,
Irvine,	Speakman,
Jelliff,	Spencer,
Johnston,	Steedsman,
Kellner,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Wallace,
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Ward,
Knox,	Woods,
	Woodsworth—45.

NAYS

Messrs:

Archambault,	Lapointe,
Arthurs,	Lavigueur,
Baldwin,	Leger,
Baxter,	Lovett,
Béland,	Macdonald (Pictou),
Binette,	MacKelvie,
Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bouchard,	MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Boucher,	McBride,
Bourassa,	McCrea,
Bureau,	McGiverin,
Cardin,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	McMurray,
Casgrain,	McQuarrie,
Chevrier,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp,	Marcile (Bagot),
d'Anjou,	Martell,
Déchène,	Meighen,
Delisle,	Michaud,
Denis (St. Denis),	Mitchell,
Desaulniers,	Morrissy,
Descoteaux,	Munro,
Deslauriers,	Murdock,
Dickie,	Murphy,
Duff,	Ouimet,
Duncan,	Papineau,
Fafard,	Parent,
Fielding,	Pelletier,
Fontaine,	Power,
Forrester,	Putnam,
Fortier,	Rinfret,
Gauvreau,	Robb,
Gendron,	Roberge,
Gervais,	Robinson,
Graham,	St. Père,
Grimmer,	Séguin,
Hammell,	Sheard,
Hatfield,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Hocken,	Spence,
Hubbs,	Stevens,
Hughes,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Jones,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Kay,	Stewart (Leeds),
King (Kootenay),	Sutherland,
Kyte,	Tobin,
Lanctôt,	Vien—92.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

For amendment.	Against amendment.
Mr. Gould,	Mr. Cannon,
Mr. Caldwell,	Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to introduce an amendment which I placed before the committee:

That this Bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the committee with instructions to amend section 30 by adding thereto as subsection 4 the following:

Such officers, clerks and servants shall have and be deemed to have the right of association for all lawful purposes.

An hon. MEMBER: The same division.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I understand there are some hon. gentlemen who voted against the other amendment but intend to vote in favour of this.

The House divided on the proposed amendmend of Mr. Woodsworth which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Archambault,	Lewis,
Bancroft,	Lovie,
Bird,	Lucas,
Campbell,	Maclean (York),
Coote,	Macphail,
d'Anjou,	McBride,
Denis (St. Denis),	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Elliott (Dundas),	McMurray,
Evans,	Martell,
Forke,	Neill,
Gardiner,	Power,
Garland (Bow River),	Rinfret,
Good,	Ross (Simcoe),
Hocken,	St. Père,
Hoey,	Sales,
Hopkins,	Shaw,
Humphrey,	Speakman,
Irvine,	Spencer,
Johnston,	Steedsman,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Stewart (Humboldt),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Wallace,
Knox,	Ward,
Leader,	Woodsworth—46.

NAYS

Messrs:

Arthurs,	Delisle,
Baldwin,	Desaulniers,
Baxter,	Descoteaux,
Béland,	Deslauriers,
Benoit,	Dickie,
Binette,	Duff,
Boivin,	Duncan,
Bouchard,	Fafard,
Boucher,	Fielding,
Bourassa,	Fontaine,
Bureau,	Forrester,
Cardin,	Fortier,
Carroll,	Gauvreau,
Casgrain,	Gendron,
Chevrier,	Gervais,
Copp,	Graham,
Déchène,	Grimmer,

Hammell,	Mitchell,
Hatfield,	Morrissy,
Hubbs,	Munro,
Hughes,	Murdock,
Jones,	Ouimet,
King (Kootenay),	Papineau,
Kyte,	Parent,
Lanctôt,	Pelletier,
Lapointe,	Prevost,
Lavigueur,	Putnam,
Leger,	Robb,
Lovett,	Séguin,
Macdonald (Pictou),	Sheard,
MacKelvie,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Maclean (Halifax),	Spence,
McCrea,	Stevens,
McGiverin,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
McIsaac,	Stewart (Hamilton),
McQuarrie,	Stewart (Leeds),
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Sutherland,
Marcile (Bagot),	Tobin,
Meighen,	Vien—79.
Michaud,	

PAIRS

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

For amendment.	Against amendment.
Mr. Gould,	Mr. Cannon,
Mr. Caldwell,	Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

Mr. BUREAU: Before the main motion is put, I should like to know from the Minister of Finance if there is in the Bank Act any provision that forbids bank clerks from associating together for lawful purposes.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no such provision.

Main motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS

ONTARIO ELECTIONS AND PETAWAWA CAMP

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) for committee of Ways and Means:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer on this motion to two matters. The first is to recall a question which I put to the government last Friday, and in which I called attention to the inability of certain of the active militia to vote in the approaching provincial election in Ontario and asked that arrangements be made in such a way that those members would not be disfranchised. The Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) went into the matter as he had promised, and in conversation with officers of the department, ascertained that the date had been fixed three or four months ago and two or three months before the date of the Ontario elections was announced; furthermore that as, under present estimates, only eight days' training is allowed, anything in the nature of a three-day break in the middle would, of course, destroy the effect of the entire training and, as was urged and as, I believe, was right, was out of the question. A deferring would have meant a cost of many thousands of dollars. The Acting Minister of National Defence reported those circumstances to the House; he stated that he was sending to the Attorney General of Ontario a telegram setting out the facts I have recited and requesting that the attorney general instruct the returning officers affected in about five cities to admit these votes at the advance polls, and he undertook if legislation were necessary to ratify, to support such legislation in the next House if he were still in the government. I acquiesced in that telegram being sent, and I undertook, on behalf of the Conservative party in the House, that that legislation would, if necessary, be ratified by them, should they be returned. Similar action, I might say, was found necessary in the late election and was acquiesced in by all parties affected. There should have been no difficulty whatever in this case. I wish to ask the Acting Minister of National Defence what has been the attitude of the Attorney General of Ontario toward the matter and whether we are going to be faced with the disfranchisement of members of our active militia merely because they are doing their duty.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has reviewed the facts in connection with this matter up to the point of sending the telegram which was despatched from the department on June 15 addressed to the Hon. Mr. Raney, Attorney General of the Province of Ontario, Toronto. The telegram reads:

> Detachments of batteries from Gananoque, Belleville, Peterborough, Guelph, Hamilton, Cobourg, schedule to train at Petawawa overlapping polling date June 25. Impractical to permit voters to return home for election. Alternative is for you to permit votes to be cast in home towns prior to departure under terms of advance polling provision your election act. If legislation does not give power suggest that above action be taken and ratified at next session of your legislature. Am informed Mr. Ferguson who is now here will agree to this proposal. Premier King approves of this proposal. If you agree public announcement should be made at once. Reply.

On the 16th, the following reply was received, not from Mr. Raney, but from Mr. A. M. Dymond, the chief election officer of the province:

> Your wire addressed to attorney general referred to me, no authority whatever for action suggested by you. Would advise postponement of entrainment for camp until after polling day, announcement made more than month ago of date of pollings.

In answer to this the following telegram was sent to the Hon. Mr. Raney himself. It was not addressed to Mr. Dymond, because we felt that the attorney general of the province ought to deal with an important matter of this kind himself. On the 18th of June we addressed this telegram to the Hon. Mr. Raney:

Following wire received:

Here we quoted in full telegram received from Mr. Dymond.

Dates of training Petawawa fixed over three months ago. Detachments from Ontario, Quebec and Maritime provinces involved. In view of heavy expense entailed and interference with private arrangements of members non-permanent active militia no alteration dates practicable. Propose publish my wire June 15th.

That was on the 18th of June, and so far there has been no reply. I shall briefly state the situation. Six batteries of artillery consisting of 38 officers and men each, or a total of 282 men, entrained on Friday to go to camp at Petawawa, where they will spend eight days, including the day occupied in going out and the day in coming back. Their training is of a special nature which can be given only at Petawawa, and includes three days of shooting in addition to other necessary drill and training in other respects. I may observe that Mr. Hay, the leader of the Liberal party in Ontario, was communicated with on the day on which the telegram was sent to Mr. Raney. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) properly states that the only way in which these men can exercise the franchise, if they go into camp at Petawawa, will be for the provincial authorities of Ontario to arrange for the taking of advanced polls. I am informed by the officers of my department that it would involve the country in a loss of between $7,000 or $8,000 if any change were made now in the dates fixed for this training, which dates were settled upon long before any provincial or other election was in prospect. I am surprised that the authorities in Ontario have not responded to our suggestion. I do think that an arrangement might have been made between the different political parties by which the votes of these men might be taken to-morrow or Friday before they entrained for camp. As Petawawa is a little to the west of the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway in the northern part of the province there would be great difficulty, even if it were practicable, for any of the officers or men to get to their homes to vote, for it would take them at least three days to accomplish this purpose. Obviously therefore the only means of having them exercise the franchise is that which we have suggested.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) would go on to-night with the bill to repeal the Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill. I should be glad to have this bill proceeded with.

Mr. FIELDING: There is one remaining budget resolution which it was announced would be taken up to-day. I do not suppose that it would take up very much time, and I should prefer to dispose of it and make way for the Lake of the Woods bill. Has the hon. member any objection?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We cannot be sure how long the resolution will take. If it lasted very long it would not be convenient to me.

Mr. FIELDING: If the debate is protracted I will postpone the resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister withdrew his motion and we took up the Lake of the Woods bill he could go into Ways and Means afterwards.

Mr. FIELDING: That rather interferes with our plans, but I will accede to the request. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the motion be withdrawn and that the order for the second reading of the Lake of the Woods bill be proceeded with.

Motion withdrawn.

LAKE OF THE WOODS REGULATION

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 175 to repeal the Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister might give us a statement of the present position of this matter, having regard to the attitude of Ontario on the one hand and of Manitoba on the other, as well as that of the Dominion government.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This bill is the same as the one that was introduced last year and accepted by the House of Commons, but rejected by the Senate. The purpose of the bill is to repeal chapter 38, 11 and 12 George V, passed in 1921 and assented to on the 4th of June of that year. In 1920, there was an understanding between the Ontario government and the Dominion government to the effect that a commission composed of four members, two to be appointed by the Ontario government and two by the Dominion government, would control the waters of the Lake of the Woods, Lac Seul, English river and Winnipeg river. It was agreed that legislation should be submitted to the legislature

of Ontario and the parliament of Canada for the purpose of organizing that com-
10 p.m. mission. The Dominion government accordingly introduced a bill which passed as chapter 10, of 11 and 12 George V, which was assented to on the 3rd of May, 1921. The government of Ontario, proceeding also in accordance with the agreement to which I have referred, introduced similar legislation; but the premier of the province, facing an opposition to the measure, withdrew it. Under these circumstances the government of the day, considering it important that some commission should have authority to control these waters, passed another bill, which became chapter 38 of 11 and 12 George V, to which I referred at the outset. The second clause of that act provided that—

All dams, structures and other works of whatsoever description which have heretofore been or may hereafter be constructed in, upon, over, about or across,—(a) any outlet of the Lake of the Woods, (b) the Winnipeg river at or about its junction with English river, or (c) English river at the outlet of and below Lac Seul, which do or may or can in any wise control, regulate or affect the outflow of water from the said lakes, or either of them, or the natural levels of the water in the said lakes, or either of them, at any time, or the natural flow of the water in the Winnipeg river or in English river, at any time, are and each of them is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

The last clause reads as follows:

If the necessary legislation of Ontario referred to in the preamble of The Lake of the Woods Control Board Act, 1921—

That is, chapter 10.

—be enacted by the legislature, the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, repeal or suspend this act and the regulations made thereunder at any time when or after The Lake of the Woods Control Board Act, 1921, shall come into force: Provided that notwithstanding any repeal or suspension of this act in the manner provided by this section the works and each of them hereby declared to be for the general advantage of Canada shall remain and continue to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

Acting under the provisions of that statute the government of the day appointed a commission, also composed of four members, as agreed upon. I understand that the government of Ontario was asked to appoint two of the members of the commission but they refused to do so, contending that this statute should never have been passed and that the works of the Lake of the Woods, the English River and the Winnipeg river should not have been declared works for the general advantage of Canada. Last year the then Solicitor General introduced a bill similar to the one now under consideration. I may say that in the session following the Act of 1921 the legislature of Ontario did pass the legislation which had been agreed upon, and last session the then Solicitor General thought we should simply repeal chapter 38 of the statutes of 1921. After some debate the bill was adopted by the House but was subsequently rejected by the Senate. After prorogation, at the instance of the premiers of Ontario and Manitoba, a conference took place in Ottawa in which the premiers of those provinces and the Prime Minister of Canada took part. After discussion and deliberation the representatives of the three governments arrived at an understanding which was put in writing and signed by them. The first clause of that agreement reads as follows:

This agreement, as a working basis for the regulation of the English and Winnipeg rivers, is entered into on the understanding that all parties are agreeable to the repeal of the Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921, but Ontario does not bind itself to the terms of this agreement in the event of that act not being repealed.

Then follow the different clauses which were accepted by the three parties. Consequent upon these circumstances we introduced the present bill. After it was read the first time representations were made to us first by the government of Manitoba and afterwards by the government of Ontario. The government of Manitoba urged that chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1921 should not be repealed until the provisions of the arrangement of November last had been fulfilled. We had a conference and listened to the arguments of the representatives of Manitoba. We told them that this bill would come into force only by proclamation, and that that proclamation should be made only when the essential conditions of the arrangement entered into had been fulfilled. Subsequently the representatives of the Manitoba government wrote a letter to the Prime Minister stating that they could not accept the suggestion that we should proceed with this bill at the present session. In reply the right hon. Prime Minister wrote the following letter to Mr. Farmer, the mayor of Winnipeg:

Dear Mr. FARMER:

I have duly received the letter dated the 29th instant signed by yourself and Messrs. Preudhomme, Sanger, Guy and Johnson, with respect to the above.

You are quite correct in your understanding that the repeal act should not become effective until the conditions of the agreement of November last have been complied with. You suggest that the repeal bill should be amended in such a way as to provide that it shall go into effect on proclamation only after Ontario and Manitoba respectively have so requested by order in council. With reference to this suggestion I would like to point out that the bill has been drafted in a matter which would permit of no exception being taken by the Ontario government to its

provisions. Were the conditions you propose incorporated, it might only serve to raise a fresh obstacle to the final settlement of this whole matter, which is now so near the point of satisfactory adjustment. Our government has in view but the one object of effecting a settlement of the question in a manner which will be wholly satisfactory to all parties concerned. We are as favourably disposed toward the province of Manitoba as toward the province of Ontario, and, inasmuch as the federal government, not less than the governments of Ontario and Manitoba, is a party to the agreement of November last, I think you may take it for granted that we would not take any action or permit any action to be taken which would prejudice the right of either Manitoba or Ontario under any of the conditions of the agreement.

With this assurance I hope you will feel that Manitoba will be justified in withdrawing any opposition it may have to the Repeal Bill in the form in which it has been presented to parliament.

With this assurance, Mr. Speaker, given by the right hon. the Prime Minister of this Dominion speaking for himself and for his colleagues, I do not see that the government of Manitoba can persist in any opposition to the measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the government of Manitoba persisting in opposition, may I ask?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have here a letter which was written by the Hon. Mr. Johnson, counsel for Manitoba and the power interests, dated June 18th, which reads as follows:

On the 31st ultimo you wrote a letter to Mayor S. J. Farmer of Winnipeg on this subject, and you very kindly sent me a copy thereof. Immediately on the return to Winnipeg of the delegation which waited upon you in Ottawa the Manitoba power interests conferred and discussed your letter with the greatest care.

We note that you desire to take no step which would permit of any exception being taken by the Ontario government to the repealing of the above act. We would, however, point out that the order in council passed by the province of Ontario in connection with the agreement entered into last November makes the absolute repeal of "The Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921," a condition precedent to the coming into force of the agreement, and also to the empowering of the minister mentioned therein to finally negotiate and settle upon the conditions to be carried out; this attitude of Ontario will make impossible the carrying out of the conditions of the agreement prior to the proclamation of the repealing act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That letter was written on behalf of the Manitoba government as well as the power interests?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: For Manitoba and the power interests.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I have listened to the recital of the history of the legislation leading up to this bill from the lips of the Minister of Justice with much interest, and speaking in the main I take no exception so far as it was a statement of facts, but a review of the question will surely, I believe, bring home to hon. members of this House the unwisdom of passing this legislation at this time.

Everyone understands that in the Lake of the Woods and in the waters flowing therein and thereout the Dominion has a very substantial and indeed a varied interest. We have an interest, first of all, because it is an international body of water. We have an interest, secondly, because it is a navigable water and is navigated, and we have an interest thirdly, because the whole body of water is interprovincial, and in respect of the flow of the water the interests of two provinces are very great. We have an additional interest as yet, and perhaps permanently. We are the owners of the resources of Manitoba and responsible for their administration, and among the resources, and among the most valuable, are the water-powers constituted by the waters that flow out of the Lake of the Woods into lake Winnipeg. So from those four standpoints all of them important, the first and the last being the greatest, and the last being really in practical results the greatest of all—from those standpoints we have a very vital interest in the proper administration of all works affecting those waters. This was recognized years ago, and as a consequence there was referred, with the assent I believe of all concerned, to the International Joint Commission the question as to the best method of control. The International Joint Commission had the case presented by the United States and by Canada, because being an international stream the United States had an interest in it. They had an interest as well because of certain powers that are developed on the inflowing waters. The International Joint Commission after the fullest evidence, and after I believe a remarkably successful presentation of Canada's case made a report, and for some five or six years we have been endeavouring to carry out that report, endeavouring against great obstacles.

In the body of that report it was recommended that in respect of the exercise of certain powers a joint board be established half by Ontario and half by the Dominion, the Dominion representing Manitoba as well as all Dominion rights, which board was to have control of the levels of the lakes so long as those levels were maintained between two definite fixed heights. If the levels got above or below, the jurisdiction of the board ceased and another board was recommended to be established to exercise jurisdiction—an inter-

national board. Pursuant to the report, conferences were held between the governments of Manitoba, of the Dominion and of the province of Ontario, and the difficulties that intervened were smoothed away to the extent that the government of Ontario agreed with the government of Canada that concurrent bills would be introduced as government measures, and pressed as government measures, looking to the establishment of the joint board. The Dominion government carried out its part of the undertaking to the full. The measure was introduced, and against considerable opposition passed this House. It passed the Senate and became law. It was later introduced in the legislature of Ontario, and on a show of opposition was deliberately withdrawn by the Premier of Ontario.

I am quite within the fact when I say that the withdrawal of the bill without any attempt to put it through right at the close of the session was in no way a fulfilment of the undertaking that the Premier of Ontario made not only with ourselves but in the presence of representatives of Manitoba. We were then left in the position of having our own statute that was passed totally ineffective, and consequently having so far as statutory power was concerned no real authority, no real statutory basis upon which to rest our control of those waters. It is true that up to that time or up to a time shortly before, a board had operated to control the waters in a measure without statutory powers. The board found itself helpless to achieve its ends and appealed to the government for statutory powers. In such a position of helplessness we found ourselves upon the collapse of the legislation in the legislature of Ontario. I thereupon introduced as Prime Minister a bill called "The Lake of the Woods Regulation Act," wherein it was provided that a board should be established and be given certain powers, namely, the powers recommended to be given the joint board by the International Joint Commission, this board to be established by the federal authorities.

The bill went further and provided that the works named in the recital read by the Minister of Justice, works built in the outlets of the Lake of the Woods at the junction of English river and Winnipeg river, and in the English river below the outlet of Lac Seul, should be declared works for the general advantage of Canada. Hon. members, of course, know that in the provisions of the British North America Act the parliament of Canada has power to declare any works to be for the general advantage of the Dominion, works which presumably theretofore were works over which the provinces had legislative jurisdiction. That power on the part of the parliament of Canada is unrestrained, but in practice is exercised wherever the works are such as affect the people of more than one province, where the works are such that, in the judgment of parliament, federal legislative control is preferable to provincial control. Now, I desire to point out that in the understanding that was arrived at with the Prime Minister of Ontario and after hearing by the government on the part of the government of Manitoba, there was no provision for the declaring of these works to be for the general advantage of Canada, nor was there anything done or agreed to which in the least degree restrained the power or the right of the government or of parliament to so declare if it saw fit; the matter was entirely left without reference at all. In a word, nothing that was done was at all inconsistent with this being done, but the government did not recommend its being done until the time came when the government of Ontario failed to go through with its undertaking with the government of Canada.

In the legislation that was introduced, as the Minister of Justice has clearly pointed out, it was provided that this board be established by the federal government to do the work the joint board was to have done under the previous concurrent legislation. It was also provided that as soon as the province of Ontario should pass that concurrent legislation, then the provisions of this bill establishing the board should be repealable by order in council of this government. For the purpose of the repeal of all the provisions establishing the board and giving it its powers the government needs no legislation here; they may repeal it all by order in council. The portion that declared the works to be works for the general advantage of Canada was not repealable by order in council. This bill is to repeal that portion too. I want to say, supplementary to what the Minister of Justice said, that in the legislation now sought to be repealed, the Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, though a new board was to be appointed to do the work that it was originally intended and agreed should be done by a joint board under the concurrent legislation, it was stated at the time by myself that it was intended to appoint by the federal government the very same men who had acted before, half of them being appointed by the provincial government. This we actually set out to perform but the Ontario government failed to permit—such is my recollection—failed to

permit its employees, to take part as members of that board, refused to allow them to do so. Last session, that is the year before this one, the legislation was put through in the province of Ontario. Why it was not done the session before I do not know to this day. It was done last session, a year ago. Then this government instead of repealing the bill establishing the board by order in council, as it might have done, came to parliament and said "We want to repeal the whole bill, and we want to restore the provincial jurisdiction," that is the provincial legislative jurisdiction over the works in this body of water. To that I made opposition at the time.

I urged then, as I urge now, that these are works that ought to be declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, because they really are works for the general advantage of Canada. We have declared over and over again a few miles of railway wholly within a province to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. Here are works as respects which the province of Manitoba, though the works are in Ontario, is perhaps even more interested than the latter province. The power assets that the flow of the water constitutes are, to the extent I think of about 80 per cent, in the province of Manitoba, and the future commercial development of Manitoba is dependent upon the just and equitable legislative administration of those works. I repeat what I said a year ago: If there ever were works that ought to be declared works for the general advantage of Canada, that are appropriate for such declaration, these are the very works. Now, if you declare works to be for the general advantage of Canada you may if you wish, and I am quite prepared we shall, agree to a joint board for their administration. Quite right and proper. So long as the joint board continues it may be all right, and it may not, I do not know; but the legislation establishing that board may be repealed at any time by the government of Ontario, and also there may be things done under it that will be unfair and unjust to one of the provinces concerned; and, consequently, the reservation of the legislative jurisdiction in this parliament should not be lightly thrown away.

It will be recalled—and this is most interesting at this time; it is most interesting, and indeed it is illuminating—that when this legislation was before the House last session the Prime Minister of this country, in an endeavour to put it through, referred to the conduct of the late government—my own conduct in particular—in introducing the Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, because of the failure to pass concurrent legislation in Ontario, as a piece of sharp practice. How interesting it is now to find that this government has agreed in writing to maintain that sharp practice on the statute books of Canada up to a certain time and after this bill passes, agreed that it is right and just to do it in the interest of the province of Manitoba. What an illuminating fact! The letter read by the Minister of Justice, signed by the Prime Minister of Canada, agrees with the province of Manitoba that this legislation that rests on sharp practice must be continued on our statute books even after the bill empowering its repeal passes, and until certain events transpire, to safeguard the interests of Manitoba. I do not refer to the language with any particular resentment; I leave hon. members to judge of it themselves and to say what they think of it. But would anyone want a more ample vindication of the need of the legislation when it passed, than the fact that this government—so anxious to denounce it in order to strike a blow at the late government—nevertheless finds itself compelled to agree in writing to its continuance as part of the law of Canada, a continuance for an indefinite time to come, until Ontario does certain things that Manitoba has enjoined in that agreement, and that this government has enjoined in this agreement with Ontario.

Now such is exactly the situation. What is the present precise position? The minister says we want to repeal the act, but we are putting in a clause that this repeal will not take effect until, later on, we declare by order in council that it shall, and our Prime Minister has given a letter to the government of Manitoba in which he says, we will not, by order in council, declare that this repeal shall take effect until Ontario does the various things recited in an agreement as binding upon Ontario to do. Manitoba states that the things Ontario is to do are concurrent with the repeal, and she will not agree to the repeal until Ontario does them, or until she by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, requests this repealing bill to be called into effect.

Manitoba stands to-day opposed to this legislation, and I am glad that Manitoba does oppose it. I only say this as respects the attitude of the Manitoba government: if the Manitoba government at this time looks far enough ahead, if it sees all round the question and the dangers involved in it, it will make its resistance to this legislation absolute and conditional on nothing at all. The only safeguard for the permanent preservation of the

varying interests of the various parties in these great powers is the reservation of this section. With the section there there need be no difficulty and there need be no danger at all, because the parliament of Canada, which has concern for one as much as the other, has its legislative control intact; so that, as far as my advice will go—and it will go very far, I fear—I will say to the government of Manitoba: Maintain your resistance; do not make it conditional, as you do to-day; do not say that it will lapse when two or three things are done by the province of Ontario that may be done any time, but make it continuous and absolute; reserve this section as it is the safeguard of the whole situation. With this section reserved, it is quite right and proper that there should be joint administration of it, because by that joint administration, under a board, appointed half by one and half by the other, the various details, from the point of view of each, are sure to secure adequate presentation and discussion.

But I protest against a repeal of the legislation. This House is in no way bound to repeal this legislation, by no compunc- to of honour, certainly by no compunction of interest. Both honour and interest demand that we keep it just where it is, and I appeal to the Minister of Justice, who has not the same tortuous record in respect of this that his Prime Minister has, to look upon the matter from a long Canadian point of view. Does it not seem to him that it is going to be best in the long years to come that these works, some of them the most important, that could well be conceived from the general standpoint, continue to be works for the general advantage; and, therefore, continue to be works under the ultimate legislative control of parliament? Let the Minister of Justice ask himself the question, why should they not continue? Why should there be anything in Canada declared to be works for the general advantage of the country, if these works now declared to be so, are to be undeclared by this act? I cannot conceive of anything that more appropriately or usefully comes within the category to which the section of the British North America Act was intended to apply than the very works contemplated by this legislation. I hope, in the interests of Ontario and of Manitoba, that the Minister of Justice will come to my point of view, or that parliament will come to my point of view, and defeat the legislation.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): I find that I cannot support the Minister of Justice in the bill he has introduced to-night. In fact, I find that I must strenuously and forcefully, and to the best of my ability, oppose the measure which he proposes to pass. I find myself, Sir, substantially in accord with the well-reasoned argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). The history of the relationship of the Dominion government, of the province of Ontario, of Manitoba and of the United States, in connection with this inter-provincial and international body of water, really one body of water, the Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg river and its tributary the English river, I shall not review at any length, but only incidentally, as that has been covered in previous debates in this House and well reviewed to-night by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Suffice it to say that there are very large and important interests involved in this question, the interests of the province of Manitoba, and the interests of this Dominion; because this Dominion holds the resources that are involved in the Winnipeg river as trustees for the people of the province of Manitoba, and has all the duties and responsibilities that attach to a trustee.

What is the legislation that the hon. the Minister of Justice proposes to repeal? What is that bill? Does that bill contain anything more than the protection of the interests of this Dominion and of the interests of the people of the province of Manitoba? Now these interests are very large, particularly so far as this Dominion and the province of Manitoba are concerned. There is a water-power valued altogether at some $60,000,000, as horse-power is generally sold. It is necessary to preserve those interests by regulating the flow of the water from that river, and this legislation centres around the regulation of the flow of water. There are facts brought out in connection with the investigation which show that, by proper regulation, the amount of water flow, 220,000 horse-power now so far as Manitoba is concerned, would by better regulation be almost doubled, and would amount to 416,000 horse-power, having an added value to the province of Manitoba of some $20,000,000. The proper regulation of that flow would also make a gain to the province of Ontario of some $9,000,000. The bill that it is proposed to pass will withdraw an act that has protected the interests of this Dominion, and that is a matter to be considered very carefully in the interests of the Dominion itself.

Now, it appears that there was a possibility of some arrangement being effected between the province of Manitoba and the province of

Ontario through the medium of, and by negotiation with, the Dominion government. The proposal made by the province of Manitoba was a reasonable and fair one. It simply said that they entered into an agreement, and that agreement made certain provisions. The representatives of Manitoba contend that this was a tentative agreement, that certain antecedent things should be done, and when they were done the province of Manitoba would agree. Those things have not been done. I may recite a portion of the agreement, and show what it is that the province of Manitoba demands to be completed before this bill becomes law. The provisions read:

1. That the Lake of the Woods Control Board should immediately investigate and report to the three governments concerned the possibility of an alternative structure above Norman dam, or failing such being found under what procedure and auspices should the Norman dam be expropriated.

2. The same board was to canvass the situation and make proper representations to Canada and Ontario as to the regulations necessary to make practically effective the unproclaimed concurrent legislation.

3. Provision for storage rights on Lac Seul upon application by Manitoba interests.

Those were antecedent conditions. Those have not been fulfilled. This Dominion government says through its ministers: "These must now be subsequent." This seems really too bad when we were approaching what might be a settlement. I think, as the leader of the Opposition has urged, Manitoba is conceding a good deal. He urges Manitoba to maintain the last clause passed in the bill that it is now proposed to repeal. To me this seems a reasonable and proper thing. Surely these works are works for the general advantage of Canada. It is proposed in this bill that the Dominion government shall not proclaim the bill; that it shall not become law until the Dominion government is satisfied that the agreement entered into by the three governments or representatives of the three governments shall have been fully complied with. The interests of Ontario in this are more or less incidental. To Manitoba, her people and particularly the city of Winnipeg, this is absolutely vital. The city of Winnipeg has its industrial life in the wonderful water-powers of the Winnipeg river. Vast development can be made there in the future. There is or will be before this House a measure in connection with a hemp proposition. If that works through, it will use vast quantities of water-power, giving employment to large numbers of people, and producing great wealth to western Canada, in fact to Canada as a whole. Already vast quantities of horse-power for various projects are being taken from this same river. The industrial life of the city of Winnipeg, a large and populous city, depends upon this river. The ancient Romans worshipped the Tiber, but the Tiber was not as important to the great city of Rome as the Winnipeg river is to the city of Winnipeg and its inhabitants.

Why should Manitoba make the Dominion of Canada its trustee, or its guardian, or its mouthpiece, or its appraiser, to say that Ontario has complied with the agreement? Why should Manitoba appoint a substitute to act for it? Let Ontario comply fully with the conditions of the agreement, and complete the undertakings it has agreed to carry out to the satisfaction of Manitoba, which is greatly and vitally interested. When Manitoba says that it is satisfied and Ontario says that it is satisfied, it will be time for this bill to pass this House; then it will be time for this House to take the proper and necessary action to carry out the agreement between the three parties. There are always dangers of misunderstandings. There may be verbal misunderstandings, and always the interpretation of written documents brings about misunderstandings. What this Dominion government and its ministers may understand, Manitoba and the various interests that entered into the negotiation may have a different view of altogether. It is because this is so absolutely vital to Manitoba, because it is its very industrial life, and because it is only incidental to Ontario, that Manitoba can afford to take absolutely no chances upon this matter. I believe Manitoba has conceded altogether too much in consenting to the withdrawal of that legislation which says that these works are for the public interest of the Dominion. Manitoba has reason to view with suspicion the situation that exists in connection with the Winnipeg river, not to view with suspicion the action of this government, which I believe to be sincere and earnest and to have an absolute desire to carry out the contract. I maintain, however, that the government is mistaken in its attitude and view, and it is proceeding wrongly. Conditions that were antecedent should not be made subsequent.

But into this there enters another element to which neither of the previous speakers this evening has alluded. A private person has secured large interests upon those waters that feed down the Winnipeg river into Manitoba. This man has reaped a fortune out of the timber limits of Ontario bordering upon Manitoba. He has secured unusual and large rights from Ontario. His attitude in dealing with those, from the first time he appeared before

public bodies in negotiations between this Dominion and the United States, was unsatisfactory. He secured a dam known as the Norman dam, and I understand, being secure in that position, he proposed to sell that to Manitoba at an exorbitant, unwarranted and extraordinarily high price. When this negotiation was going on and we had more or less secured control over the Norman dam, we find a remarkable thing; we find this man securing power rights at the White Dog rapids lower down on the Winnipeg river, and this again placed completely in his hands a control which we had more or less taken away from him. Later on we find him advancing from this position to secure large timber limits upon the English river, which is a large and majestic stream, much larger than the river which flows by this House. He is now in control of that water-power there. The people of Winnipeg fear this adventurer; they fear that he will not hesitate at all to reap to the full any advantage that he may have there. They have observed the relationship existing between him and Ontario; they have noticed the remarkable manner in which he secured these valuable timber limits, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, they are very valuable. It is this man Backus that we particularly fear in Manitoba. He is not possessed, in our opinion, of the fine, jovial and genial qualities of the god Bacchus of old, but more of the horns and cloven hoofs, at least, as he is seen by the people of Manitoba situated at the head of the waters of the river that gives them their industrial life. It is because of this uncertainty; because of the peculiar situation in connection with the refusal of the government of Ontario to pass that bill a year ago; because of the relationship of Backus to that government and the large interests he has acquired on that river; because of the suspected disposition of Backus —it is because of all this that we are opposed to this measure. I do not know the man at all, but I am speaking of his repute so far as his relationship to these water-powers on the Winnipeg river is concerned.

Man naturally is selfish. As he increases in wealth the tendency is that he will become more selfish; and taking human nature as it is, not alleging that Backus is any better or worse than any of the rest of us, but simply taking human nature as we find it, it is a dangerous thing for the province of Manitoba and its people to have this man at its head waters to control the very life of the city of Winnipeg and its industrial interests. I find myself, therefore, strongly opposed to this bill. By the passing of it the Dominion is releasing control over rights to which it is entitled. By passing this bill it deprives the province of Manitoba of the protecton that it now enjoys and leaves it in an unprotected position. The attitude taken by the province of Manitoba is reasonable in the extreme. They have only demanded that the bill should not become law until the agreement referred to by the Minister of Justice and myself, should be completed, not to the satisfaction of the Dominion alone, but to the satisfaction of the Dominion and of the people of Manitoba, to the satisfaction of those who signed the contract. I strongly oppose the bill.

Mr. A. B. HUDSON (South Winnipeg): The subject matter of the bill has been discussed in the House on a number of occasions, and while I do not propose to go into the facts at any great length there are some circumstances which I think might fairly be brought to the attention of hon. members. At an early stage it was agreed by everybody, that is to say, by those representing the Dominion, the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba, that the waters in question should be controlled and regulated. The question then arose as to how this should be accomplished and by whom, and as a result of negotiations which the Minister of Justice has referred to concurrent legislation was introduced in this parliament and in the legislature of Ontario. That concurrent legislation was to my mind defective in one very vital point: it created a board of four, two to be appointed by Ontario and two by the Dominion, nobody having a casting vote. That legislation was agreed to, not because it was satisfactory, but because it was the best kind of agreement that could be got under the circumstances. But everyone will see that it opened the door to trouble in the future when it provided for no casting vote; for the moment the interests of Ontario conflicted with those of Manitoba there would be a deadlock and control would cease. However, it was agreed to, and, as has been stated, it was introduced into this parliament and the bill finally became law. So far as Ontario is concerned it failed, and upon its failure the Premier of Manitoba addressed to the then Prime Minister of Canada a letter which I shall read to the House. It is dated May 13, 1921, and was produced with a return in the session of 1921 when this Regulation Bill was first introduced. It is as follows:

11 p.m.

Dear Mr. MEIGHEN,

re Lake of the Woods Control Board

I have a letter from Mr. Drury advising me that he was obliged to withdraw his bill in the Ontario

legislature, and that he has since asked you to continue the present board which was established by concurrent orders in council.

As you are aware, the present board lacks the authority necessary to make its orders effective. Anyone interested in opposing its directions can do so with impunity.

For this reason, the Manitoba government asks your government to take the steps necessary to secure a proper and adequate control of the flow of the waters in question.

The steps which I wish to suggest are:—

First, that the Dominion government should at once acquire the Norman dam. The propriety of and the necessity for this action requires the support of no argument. It was suggested at the conference in your office on the 30th of January last and no objection was raised by anyone. The structure affects navigation and is necessary to carry out your international obligations. Every one must admit that it should not remain in private hands.

The second suggestion is, that parliament should be asked to declare at its present session, that works erected or to be erected in any of the waters in question are and shall be works for the general advantage of Canada under the authority of the British North America Act. Sec. 92 s.s. 10 paragraph (c).

As Mr. Drury wishes to have the present board continued, parliament might, at the same time, empower it to make regulations.

Once it is conceded that control is necessary and that this control should be exercised by a board, it follows as of course, that this board must be given adequate pwer to perform its duties.

It may be suggested that this second proposal involves an improper invasion of provincial rights. It does not appear so to me. The waters in question are navigable waters and the Dominion thereby has already very extensive powers in respect of same. The proposal is for the purpose of ensuring justice as between residents of different provinces in respect of an interprovincial stream. The waters of this stream are not the property of any one riparian owner, but are the common property of all on the banks of the river. The proposal is that there should be control. This does not affect the ownership of the water powers. The effort made to establish effective control by joint action having failed, the proposal now made is the only available method of achieving what was agreed upon. If any set of circumstances could justify action under the above section of the British North America Act, it must be justified here.

The interests of the Dominion as a whole, in the matter are considerable. As you know, it owns all of the water-powers within Manitoba. Some of these powers have been developed by lessees who have established their works in accordance with plans approved of by your government officers and on the assumption that there was to be a regulated flow of the waters in question. Many millions of dollars have been spent in these developments and on this basis. The value of the undeveloped power on the river within Manitoba is also very great. Your government has also spent large sums of money in making most complete and accurate surveys of the river and its potentialities. Under these circumstances, I submit the Dominion cannot stand by and see jeopardized, not only its own subtantial interests but the interests of those whose duty it is to protect.

Any delay will only create new difficulties. For example, only to-day I was informed that Mr. Backus, who owns the Norman dam and who also has an arrangement with Kenora as to the municipal power plant there, has published a notice in the Kenora paper of an intended application to the Department of Public Works for leave to make substantial alterations in the Kenora plant. These alterations may seriously affect the water power interests as well as those interested in navigation. This same Mr. Backus has also acquired from the Ontario government some right to erect works at White Dog Falls, He may be proceeding at once with these works and this might also affect the flow of the water.

For the reasons above mentioned, I would urge you most strongly that immediate action should be taken along the lines above indicated.

In closing, I might explain that the interest of the Manitoba government in this matter arises, first because of its duty to care for the interests of its citizens, more than one-half of whom are dependent on the development on the Winnipeg river for electrical power, and in the second place, because the Manitoba government is a user of a large quantity of power developed by the city of Winnipeg on the Winnipeg river and turned over to the government at Winnipeg for transmission to Portage la Prairie and other points in the province.

Following that letter the legislation was introduced which is called the Regulation Act, a section of which it is now proposed to repeal—a section which has been the chief cause of trouble and disappointment since that time. I think a great deal of trouble arises from a misconception of the nature of this general advantage clause. The general advantage clause does not transfer the property in the powers; it simply gives the Dominion the right to pass regulative legislation. Legislation of this kind is not new. As the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said, we have had legislation of this kind in respect to railways. But it is not confined to railways; it is a very common provision included in power charters. When the Niagara powers were being developed, this parliament passed acts incorporating the Toronto and Niagara Power Company, the Ontario Power Company and the Hamilton and Erie Power Company. In the charters of these three companies this general advantage clause was inserted. In other words, the powers owned and operated by companies at Niagara are operated under Dominion legislation declaring them to be for the general advantage of Canada. Now, one of these bills, the Toronto and Niagara Power bill, was fully discussed in this House; the House divided on the question, and many of the gentlemen now sitting on this side voted for that bill. As I have said, the general advantage clause does not take away any property rights; it simply gives the power to regulate. Let me illustrate the distinction in this way: under the British North America Act the Dominion is given authority to deal with fisheries and fishing, but the provinces still own the fish. The Dominion may make regulations concerning the times when and the manner in which the fish may be caught, but the province may lease the fishing rights,

and that illustrates the difference between the taking away of property rights and the exercising of the power of regulation.

There is a much more opposite case in the situation in Switzerland. There they have a number of streams that are of very great value for power purposes. A few years ago, when hydro-electric development began to become important, there was a great demand throughout that country that the federal government should take over all these power sites and develop them as federal enterprises. But as against this view there were a large number of people who were very much concerned about the maintenance of state rights—the states there have much larger jurisdictions than our provinces have. So they fought the proposal, and eventually a compromise was arrived at by which the federal government was given the power to regulate much as we have the power to regulate under the present act. If we repeal this act now, it seems to me it will not be long before parliament will be called upon to take similar action in other cases. It is unfortunate that no satisfactory arrangement has been concluded in the matter. I think that in the end there must be some final voice, and that voice should be that of the Dominion. For the reasons expressed by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) and the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I think parliament would make a great mistake, having regard to the interests of Canada as a whole, to repeal this legislation.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, it would be needless for me to enter into a rehearsal of what has been so well said by many of the previous speakers. It is sufficient to say that all these things would work out very acceptably if you could get the various parties to agree, but so far that condition has not been attained. I want to point out some of the difficulties that are in the way of a settlement of this dispute. In the first place, when this government took office we found, as has been pointed out by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the other two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken, that there had been an attempt to bring about joint legislation, and that an agreement in the matter had been entered into by the governments of Ontario and Manitoba and the federal government. Now, if the federal government have an interest in one province more than in another, it must of necessity be in the province of Manitoba. The Dominion are trustees for the water-powers of that province, powers which are of immense advantage to the people there, who will eventually be its owners. But what is the situation? We find that the governments of Manitoba and Ontario and the federal government agreed to the adoption of joint legislation for the control of the waters of the Lake of the Woods. We find also that a private individual has secured important rights from Manitoba and that he is a very potent factor in any attempt to make an adjustment of this matter. The federal parliament passed the legislation Premier Drury on his part undertook to put through the legislation on the part of the province, and we must take his word when he says he was unable at first to do so. Subsequently, however, he did so. Both those acts are in existence to-day. The bill passed by the legislature of Ontario is contingent upon certain things being put into effect by proclamation of the Governor in Council; until that is done these enactments do not come into effect. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) has pointed out a weakness in the arrangement, namely, that the board consists of four members and that there is likely to be a deadlock. That is true, but that is what was agreed upon. Subsequent to the passing of the act by this parliament representations were made to this government that the Ontario government had failed to pass the legislation agreed upon, and therefore some other action became necessary. The parliament of Canada undertook to pass and did pass the act that is now objected to so strenuously by the government of Ontario, what is known as the general advantage clause legislation. I would point out that no one has mentioned the fact that the Ontario government strenuously opposed that legislation. As was well pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, the first paragraph of the agreement, and of that I shall speak later, provides that this legislation must be repealed, and this has been the rock upon which attempts on the part of this government to settle this question have broken on every occasion.

Mr. McMURRAY: Who thought it was necessary that that should be done?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Premier Drury.

Mr. McMURRAY: The province of Ontario?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, absolutely. I thought I had made that clear. At the last session of this parliament we did attempt to repeal that particular clause, as

that appeared to be the way leading to a final settlement of this question. I would just like to state in connection with the argument of my hon. friend that he does not question Ontario's right to the ownership of the powers in question, but that the regulation of the power would be better in the hands of the federal government. I have not had a legal training and I do not intend to enter into an argument on that question. Suffice it for me to say to the committee that Premier Drury claims to have been advised, whether rightly or wrongly, that this is an infringement on provincial rights, and he intends to fight it to the limit and carry the case to the Privy Council. He may not succeed, but he will certainly succeed in doing one thing—he will prevent action being taken for a settlement of this question.

Mr. BAXTER: He will not have much to say about it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not pretend to have a legal training and I cannot say whether he will succeed or not, but I do say that in the meantime it will prevent action by this government for an adjustment of this question even if we have the right.

Mr. STEVENS: So long as the general advantage clause remains, how can he prevent action in a matter that is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): By taking action against the government or against any attempt at a settlement of this question.

Mr. STEVENS: How will he take such action?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He is at liberty to submit it to the courts for decision and carry the case to the Privy Council.

Mr. McMURRAY: Is this government bringing in this bill because pressure or intimidation is being brought to bear by the Ontario government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I thought I had made myself clear when I said that my sole desire, speaking for myself personally, because I have been the means of bringing these people together on two or three occasions, was to get a settlement of this question. The representatives of the province of Manitoba very recently signed an agreement that they were prepared to accept the legislation that exists now, notwithstanding what my hon. friend has said. They were prepared to accept the board for the regulation of the waters of Lac Seul. But the rock on which we split is that the general advantage clause legislation be repealed.

Mr. McMURRAY: I beg my hon.. friend's pardon. May I put this question to him?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me read the letter sent by Mr. Johnston on behalf of the power interests and the government of Manitoba. It has been read once before tonight, but I will read it in part again. It is addressed to the Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, Ottawa, and reads:

> On the 31st ultimo you wrote a letter to Mayor S. J. Farmer, of Winnipeg, on this subject, and you very kindly sent me a copy thereof. Immediately on the return to Winnipeg of the delegation which waited upon you in Ottawa the Manitoba power interests conferred and discussed your letter with the greatest care.
>
> We note that you desire to take no step which would permit of any exception being taken by the Ontario government to the repealing of the above act.

Mr. McMURRAY: Precedent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not denying that. I am simply pointing out to my hon. friend that there is no desire on the part of the government of Manitoba as was intimated by him and the other hon. member from Winnipeg, that this legislation should not be passed. It is a question of when. That is what I wanted to make clear.

Mr. McMURRAY: I admit that, so far as the regulating clauses are concerned.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am answering the contention of my hon, friends that this legislation should stand irrespective of what may be done. They contend it would be a mistake to repeal the legislation, and in effect are sustaining the position of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I am pointing out that the Manitoba government and the power interests do not expect that. They are content with the legislation, but they say this one thing: We do not want this legislation repealed until the provisions go into effect by order in council.

Mr. McMURRAY: Why does this government want it done before those provisions are complied with? This government was a party to the contract and should support the contract in its entirety.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not particular except that we desire to bring about a settlement of this vexed question.

Mr. McMURRAY: But you are introducing the bill, bringing the matter up here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry my hon. friend takes this attitude. The bill was brought in here last year. We failed to

reach an agreement, and that was largely the reason why we failed to reach an agreement. So far as the government of Canada is concerned we are quite prepared to protect the interests of Manitoba. Not only that, but we secured at the conference the signature of the Ontario government to cancel the agreement entered into with the Sioux Lookout for water power that would interfere with the level of Lac Seul and the water supply for the city of Winnipeg. I do not want to be understood as opposing any interest of Manitoba. I want to be understood rather as making an honest endeavour to bring the two conflicting parties together without litigation, if at all possible, and settle this question. If I thought for a single moment that any interest of Manitoba was being jeopardized, I certainly as trustee for the natural resources of Manitoba would stand up for Manitoba's interests as against Ontario's. My sole desire is to bring about a settlement of this question. But how are you going to settle it if certain gentlemen say: We will not agree to the repeal of the general advantage clause legislation under any consideration. It is true that the Ontario government representatives may be changed on the 25th.

Mr. HALBERT: No chance. They will be right on the job.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But we have to meet the situation as it exists to-day. If they maintain that position then my hon. friends will say "Well, let the Dominion government step in. Let them expropriate the dam held by Mr. Backus. let them fight Mr. Backus and the Ontario government." I doubt very much if that will get us very far.

Mr. McMURRAY: I do not wish to be too troublesome in my interrogations, but why be in such a hurry to put this measure through? Why not make Ontario complete her arrangement? Why should the Dominion government be so insistent in the matter?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Dominion government have never been insistent. We have called these conferences at the request of the representatives of Manitoba.

Mr. McMURRAY: Then will my hon. friend agree to allow the bill to stand if the government is not insistent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me point out to my hon. friend that this is one of the rocks which cause difficulty. If it is out of the way we can make progress. He has heard the letter read the letter ridiculed by my right hon. friend which points out that we are prepared now to maintain this legislation until an agreement is entered into and which will allow us to bring Manitoba and Ontario together. It is in the interest of all parties that the clause which is offensive to Ontario be removed as a bone of contention in the negotiations. Now, we do not say for a single moment that we are pledging ourselves that the legislation shall not go into effect until the agreement in its entirety is accepted by both governments and by the power interest concerned. Let me again say, that acting for this government, as I have done on one or two occasions, I have no other interest in the world to serve except to try to get a settlement of this very vexed question, and to bring together the parties concerned if it is humanly possible. I admit the weakness that four on a board may find the day when they will come to a deadlock, but I wish to point out that that is agreed to by legislation, that that is agreed to by this letter.

Mr. McMURRAY: Why not carry out this agreement?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If Ontario and Manitoba persist in their course; if one says on the one hand "You must remove what we consider an infringement upon provincial rights before we will move" and the other province says on their part "If you remove that we will not budge" then we are at a deadlock, and there is just one other thing for us to do: Proceed on the legislation declaring the works to be for the general advantage of Canada, and fight Mr. Backus and fight the Ontario government. Now, that is the alternative. On the other hand we have tried to be the friendly arbiter. We have tried to keep in line the interest of all parties concerned. If I thought otherwise I would not be advocating this method of settling this difficult question. And it is important that this question be settled. It is important, very important, in the interest of Manitoba that it be settled. Not only that. We cannot carry out our international agreement to regulate the levels of the Lake of the Woods until we get control of the Norman dam; and in the agreement the Ontario government has undertaken to adopt measures, by one method or another, to secure control of that dam which it is so necessary for the board to have before they will have the right to regulate the international waters at that point. That is all. I am not expressing an opinion as to the validity of the legislation.

I may frankly state that my experience in the provincial arena has made me rather anxious about provincial rights. Probably I view this matter from a different standpoint to some of my hon. friends who are sitting around me. However, I want to dismiss that altogether and try to find common ground for a settlement of this very vexed question with sufficient safeguards around it to meet the vews of all parties concerned.

Mr. HOEY: What objection would the minister have to not bringing this legislation into force until the two governments entered into an agreement and ask that it be done?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The letter my right hon. friend read points out that the existing legislation only comes into effect by proclamation.

Mr. HOEY: But not at the request of the provinces concerned.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At any rate the Prime Minister has placed this government on record as being agreeable to that method of dealing with this question.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I hesitate very much to have anything to say in this matter, but knowing the very deep interest that my right hon. leader has taken and the very important part he has played in it from its inception, I feel that I should make one more appeal to the Minister of Justice, and to state as briefly as I can a few reasons why I think this legislation should be laid over. In the first place I should like to say this: If the House wanted an argument for the staying of this legislation I think they would find it in the remarks of the Minister of the Interior. I am not saying that with any desire to reflect on him, but his presentation of the problem—indicating the complexity of it, the differences between these two provincial governments and the somewhat stubborn attitude of the Premier of Ontario—would demonstrate, to my mind at least, that it was desirable for this government to retain control of the situation until something like a better spirit of agreement obtains between the two governments. For instance, my hon. friend said a moment ago that he was quite prepared to protect the interests of Manitoba, which are admittedly very vital interests to that province; I think the House, perhaps, ought to give very careful thought to that—Manitoba's vital interests. My hon. friend says that he is quite prepared to protect Manitoba's interests, but how can he, or this government, protect Manitoba's interests with any effect by the repeal of this clause which was passed by this parliament after previously trying without it to compose the situation and finding on the authority of their experts and advisers that the situation was untenable as far as administration is concerned? Let me repeat that question, perhaps I did not make it very clear: In the early stages of this dispute this government endeavoured to compose the differences between the two provinces and on the report of their advisers and experts, they found they could not do so, because they could not make anything they did effective; and in order to make their decisions effective they had to pass this legislation declaring the works to be works for the general advantage of Canada. My hon. friend now says that in order to get together the two provinces that are estranged we should withdraw from the legislation that was found very necessary two years ago in order to make the federal influence effective.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend know that any advance has been made since the passing of that legislation?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, I would say this is clear to me—and I speak with some hesitancy and perhaps with a certain apology to the House for trespassing—it is clear to me that a very distinct advance was made in this agreement which was made last fall. My hon. friend said it was a few days ago but it was in November if I am correct, and the minister will tell me if I am wrong—it was in November, eight months ago, that this agreement was entered into, and yet Ontario has failed to live up to its terms, and we find Manitoba coming back now feeling actually alarmed that the agreement into which it had entered was not only not being observed but there was not even an attempt to observe it in all its terms. Now, that is a condition which, to my mind, not only justifies this government but makes it imperative for them to retain control of the situation until that condition is thoroughly cleared up. Now, another point—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend—my object is to have the situation clarified and put clearly before the House—but the Minister of Justice read the first paragraph of that agreement, and I thought I made it clear to the committee that that was the rock which caused all the difficulty. With that paragraph in, we were able to get that agreement.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to speak on that later on. My hon. friend points out that the two governments had been working on this

thing and had more or less failed, and he suggests virtually, though he does not say it in so many words, that the control of the situation should be turned over to Ontario. In other words, coming to my hon. friend's last question, the province of Ontario all through these negotiations from 1920—I remember it from the first discussion in the House—down to a week or two ago have taken the stand that they will do nothing until this clause is repealed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes that is right.

Mr. STEVENS: He says he wants to stand between the two governments, but he says to Manitoba, "No matter what your rights may be or how much you are injured, no matter what attitude Ontario may take towards you, we insist that you agree to Ontario's stand in this regard." That is not a reasonable position. My idea of the situation is that the Canadian government ought to take a very distinct stand, and say; No we will remain in control of the situation as an independent party.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is what we do.

Mr. STEVENS: But you are giving that away virtually.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. STEVENS: You are saying, "We are retaining the power to bring this into operation by order in council." Let me ask the hon. member—and this is really my appeal to him—if the condition of things is such that it is not necessary to pass this act now, in the final form, why not let it wait until these two goverments can compose their differences?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry I did not make that clear. All this legislation between the two governments and what we purpose now is contingent upon certain things being done, and when they are done the legislation goes into effect. If the bill passes this House to-night, and the Governor in Council never makes the declaration, it will never come into effect.

Mr. STEVENS: Why take the power?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Simply to get a vexed question settled.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think the minister will settle it, because he tells us that Ontario will consent to nothing until this proclamation is made, or the act repealed. Manitoba comes along and says, "We are alarmed at having our interests subject to the caprice of Ontario, and we must realize that once this thing is out of the way, if there is a dispute between the two, Ontario is in control of the situation, and naturally will legislate in its own interests, and we cannot expect it to do otherwise."

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): How will Ontario be in control until this government takes the final step and asks for the proclamation of the repeal of this act?

Mr. STEVENS: I admit that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Will my hon. friend not agree that it puts this government as an arbitrator, if you will—because that is the position they are to occupy—in a very much better position to settle this question than if the act remains on the statute book and the government has no power to touch it till next session?

Mr. STEVENS: There is a very clear answer to that in the correspondence brought out to-night. If the Ontario government had kept faith with the Manitoba government, I would say your position was sound.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not want to be in the position of a pleader for Ontario, because I am not; but that is the contention of Manitoba. There may have been things they could have done more rapidly, we do know they have been moving all the time, but have not succeeded in completing the arrangements provided for.

Mr. STEVENS: I simply say that in the absence of my leader, who was called out of the House, realizing his interest in the problem, and the interest of many others who will not have an opportunity to be heard, I would ask the Minister of Justice not to press this legislation at the present time.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre): As one of the representatives of Winnipeg, I should like to join in urging that this legislation should not be pressed. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) seems to be very anxious to settle the question that, from the standpoint of Manitoba, there is danger of imperilling some of Manitoba's rights. It is not necessary for me to go into the legal and historical aspects which have been so fully discussed by the other members for Winnipeg and by the leader of the Opposition. There are, however, just a few points I should like to emphasize. Coming from Manitoba, we have almost to appeal to the generosity of the Dominion government, because we have no legal rights ourselves in this matter, and, as has been recognized, the Dominion government acts as the trustee;

and hence, if possible, greater care should be exercised because of the responsibility which the Dominion government carries in this regard. The present situation is that since 1921 Manitoba's interests are safeguarded, because as has been suggested, all the works in this area are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. So that, whatever may take place in the future, we feel that at the present moment we are comparatively safe and stand on solid ground. I think I must agree that Manitoba has been willing to concede a great deal, and has consented that under certain conditions this legislation should be repealed. The memorandum on the agreement which was made was read by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray). I should like to point out that these clauses are very general indeed. The first clause says—

> That the Lake of the Woods Control Board should immediately investigate and report to the three governments concerned the possibility of an alternative structure above the Norman dam, or failing such being found, under what procedure and auspices should the Norman dam be expropriated.

This is a general clause, involving a very careful examination and report by engineers and so on, and it is not at all clear that when these reports come in they can be readily agreed upon by the parties concerned. It is the same with the other clauses of the agreement. No details whatever are given but the understanding is that certain conditions must be fulfilled precedent to the repeal of the Lake of the Woods Regulation Act. I take it, however, that the governments have come very near to a settlement of the matter by Manitoba conceding almost everything. Manitoba, as I understand it, is desirous that the repeal bill should be so amended as to provide that it shall come into force on proclamation to be made only after Ontario and Manitoba respectfully so request by order in council. That is simply that, with a view to the large number of details that have to be decided that are not given at all in this general agreement, Manitoba ought to be satisfied before the proclamation should be made. That, it seems to me, is not an unreasonable request, and if there is anything at all in legal safeguards, Manitoba is right in claiming that these legal safeguards should be left in, until such times as there is full agreement. Let me turn, for one moment, to the practical side of the question. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the industrial life of Winnipeg is bound up with the power on the Winnipeg river. We need the light and power, and even the heat, that we get from the power generated there. We need it in our domestic economies as well as in our industrial concerns. It is very very important to the life of that City of the Plains that we should have this water-power safely guarded. This is at present imperilled. A private corporation could put the city in a very serious position, indeed, in the course of twenty-four hours. Private corporations would be in a position to cut us off entirely from our heat, light and power. The power that they might exercise by a very little change in the water levels could be illustrated by the case of the power at Pelican rapids. Let me read a paragraph or so from a memorandum with regard to that:

> In 1922 the town of Sioux Lookout was promised a lease by the Ontario government of the Pelican rapids power site on Lac Seul.
>
> This power site is so situated that it can only be of commercial value provided that the water level on Lac Seul is maintained at its normal height, hence the raising of the lake level for regulation and storage purposes destroys Pelican rapids as a power site.
>
> The promise of this lease was immediately recognized by Manitoba as a serious menace to the scheme of regulation recommended for adoption, as it sacrificed the development of 160,000 horse-power on the English and Winnipeg rivers for a possible 3,000 horse-power at Pelican rapids. A net loss of 157,000 horse-power to the two provinces.

That is just an illustration of what might happen in a number of places if rights to vater-powers are not carefully safeguarded. I would urge that the river is a continuous thing, physically continuous, and that cannot be, as it were, chopped off by arbitrary political boundaries. If the levels were raised hundreds of miles away up the stream, it might produce serious results. It is absurd to say that action in one section of the country—in Ontario—should determine the usefulness of waterpower in which Ontario is not nearly as much interested as is Manitoba. Just to show the absurdity of the situation, if Manitoba should seek to retaliate, I suppose Manitoba could readily construct a dam which would flood Ontario and destroy the powers up in that part of the river. No one would suggest that Manitoba is likely to build, as it were, a spite fence, or anything of the kind. I give that merely as an illustration of how absurd it is to try to work out this problem strictly along the lines of provincial boundaries. Further it would seem as if it would be very difficult in the case of water-powers to distinguish sharply between ownership and control. I submit this with some diffidence, because I know there is a legal distinction made on these lines, and it has already been suggested tonight that the ownership might lie with the province and the control with the Dominion. That might be true in the case of fisheries; it might be

true in other instances; but in the case of water-powers it would be sometimes difficult to apply the distinction, because control and ownership are inextricably bound up with one another. Unless you give a certain measure of control, ownership becomes absolutely valueless because the power ceases. I would urge that we must get away from a narrow interpretation which stresses provincial rights, provincial ownership of natural resources, and we must in place of that adopt a rather broader view, basing our action upon general principles, as indicated in the phrase in the legislation as it now stands, that is that we should have regard to the general advantage of Canada. I, therefore, urge that this safeguard for the people of the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba should not be taken away until Winnipeg and Manitoba, as well as Ontario, are satisfied.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words in connection with this matter, because I want to place myself on record in regard to the situation. I have tried to follow the discussion this evening as carefully as I possibly can. I realize that this is a question of very great importance, at any rate to Manitoba. I can hardly offer a solution. I can see that the representatives of Ontario are pretty much worked up over the matter, although I do not see that they have a great deal to lose in the situation. It seems to me that as regards Ontario, this is largely a matter of claiming a right that is of no particular advantage, so far as I can see. Manitoba, on the other hand, is desperately interested in this situation. By certain manipulations of the water-powers, the power could to a very large extent be taken away from Winnipeg, and this in reality would be a tragedy and a disaster. Looking at the matter dispassionately and from the outside, wanting to do justice to both parties, I cannot understand why the government should be so anxious to repeal this act at the present time. It seems to me that Ontario and Manitoba ought to be able to come together in some way, and to arrive at some arrangement on this matter before this bill is repealed.

Mr. HALBERT: Why was the late government so anxious to shove it through?

Mr. FORKE: I suppose that was done to save Manitoba at that time. I cannot begin to argue the question, because I am not aware of all the conditions, but I know the situation. I know the position the city of Winnipeg is in, and I know if these water-powers are hampered or interfered with, a disaster and a tragedy will be caused to the city of Winnipeg. There is no question about that. I am perfectly sure my hon. friends from Ontario do not wish to do any harm or injury to the city of Winnipeg, nor do I wish to do any injury to the rights and privileges of Ontario. What we want is justice and something to the advantage of both provinces in this matter.

I would venture to make another statement, and I do so with a good deal of hesitation because I am no authority. But when I look at a matter of such importance, affecting two provinces, I question very much, if I were in the position of Manitoba, if I would ever have agreed to have this privilege taken away from the Dominion of Canada proclaiming this to be for the general advantage of Canada. Manitoba, perhaps, went too far when she agreed to that. She having, however, agreed to it, the only solution I can see would be for the two governments to try to make an agreement, and then if this legislation is passed, as it may be, to arrange that it would come into force only upon a requisition from the two provinces concerned. I do not think there should be any heat over this matter. It is a matter of trying to do justice, what is right to both provinces. If this is only a matter of provincial rights, it is very foolish to get excited over a theory when, in actual practice, some solution of the question can be reached in a sensible and just manner.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to add very much to this discussion, especially at this time; but the matter is being treated or was treated last year as if it were practically entirely a question of provincial rights. It does not seem to me that it is that at all. As I understand it, the greater part if not the whole of the waters involved fall under the operation of the joint commission which has been established between Canada and the United States for the regulation of the waterflow. That means that this country, by asking the intervention of the Mother Country in the making of a treaty, has already treated this water as something that cannot pertain in its regulation to any one province, by the very fact that the treaty deals with it; and we are bound by our legislation to give effect to all treaties that are made on our behalf or which touch our interest. The whole point in introducing this bill seems to be not to get at the earlier sections of the legislation but at the last one, the vital one, the one which makes the work one for the general advantage of Canada. As has been pointed out repeatedly, even if the government of

Ontario had fulfilled its undertaking and the Dominion government had done the same, and there had been no mention, as there was none in that agreement, of the work being for the general advantage of Canada, yet from the standpoint of the necessity for giving to the commissioners of the international waters the power over these waters we should have had to declare it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. That would not alter one iota of the property in the dams or the waters or anything else. Wherever the property is, in whatever province it may be, it would still remain, and all that would be implied would be that no advantage could be taken by any provincial legislature with regard to the use or the withholding from use of that water. The rights of all parties would be preserved subject only to the supreme right which ought to rest in this parliament to prevent injury being done in the case of the exercise of provincial rights. It seems to me that the case is absolutely clear against the repeal of the former legislation if that repeal is to involve the last section which makes this declaration. If the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) wants to repeal only the other sections, I do not see that any harm will be done. But there should be left on the statutes a declaration that will do justice to all provinces and safeguard all interests, a declaration that the legislative authority of Canada will embrace this and all works connected with it.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) told us in the course of his remarks that if there were works that should be declared for the general advantage of Canada under subsection 10 of section 92 of the British North America Act, these were the works. In 1920, when an agreement was reached between the Dominion government and the government of Ontario, that section 92 was in force, and these works were in existence. The leader of the Opposition was then in power. Why did he not at that time declare that such works were for the general advantage of Canada? Why did he not make any declaration to that effect when the two governments came to the agreement that concurrent legislation should be passed by the legislature of Ontario and the Dominion government? Why was there never any mention about any such declaration when the two bills were introduced concurrently in the Ontario legislature and in the Dominion parliament? The reason is this: The province of Ontario has always protested against such a declaration being made by the parliament of Canada. That province has always contended, as it still contends, that these works are provincial works, that the powers are provincial powers, and that the Dominion government has no right to declare them for the general advantage of Canada. There was no desire to precipitate any litigation with the province of Ontario; the object was to help the province of Manitoba to deal with Ontario in regard to Lac Seul, where there are powers that may be developed for the advantage of the province of Manitoba. There was another reason. The Dominion government of that day and the provincial governments interested were desirous of obtaining a treaty with the government of the United States in regard to the Lake of the Woods. This could be done only if an agreement could be arrived at between the government of Ontario and the Dominion government. It was therefore for that reason that the understanding was reached. In 1921, when the leader of the government was informed that the executive of Ontario could not pass, at that session of the legislature, the legislation promised, he introduced the bill which is now chapter 38. On that occasion he addressed the following remarks to the House. I quote from Hansard of May 26, of that year, at page 3903:

12 m.

> The previous bill, already passed, was intended to be concurrent with legislation by the province of Ontario which did not go through, so our former bill is valueless. The present measure is designed to hold the situation in the meantime, until, if it should come to pass, the Ontario legislature enacts the concurrent legislation contemplated.

Ontario since then did pass concurrent legislation, but in spite of that the leader of the Opposition says that we should retain that proviso which we find in section 10, of chapter 38. If it had not been for that proviso, we should not have had the quarrel which has given rise to so much discussion for nearly two years. It was to arrive at a settlement of that dispute that the three governments met and entered into an agreement under which they expressed themselves as willing that chapter 38 which we are now discussing should be repealed. It is said that this can only be done when the conditions set forth in that agreement shall have been complied with. I do not see anything of that kind in the agreement, but supposing it is so and even if the conditions were complied with, the right hon. leader of the Opposition says that for no consideration, under no circumstances, would Manitoba consent to the repeal of that declaration that these works are for the general advantage of Canada. I think the House should trust the

government to the extent of believing that we will not proclaim this statute before making sure that all the conditions of the agreement of November, 1922, have been complied with. If we take the attitude that we should wait until everything is perfect and complete, what would Manitoba obtain from Ontario? Manitoba has already presented to Ontario a request that they be given the right to store waters in Lac Seul. Ontario says, "We are prepared to enter into an arrangement with you provided that the statute of 1921 is repealed." If we do not repeal that proviso; if we proceed to exercise control through the board over the dam at the Lake of the Woods and all the other works on English river and the Winnipeg river, we shall render ourselves liable to action any day, next month or next year, by the government of Ontario. We are asked, how could Ontario proceed? There are many methods of procedure; there have been cases in the past where similar questions have been taken as far as the Privy Council. If this bill does not become law, the province to suffer most will be Manitoba, because they will never get from the province of Ontario the rights for which they are asking.

We are told that we should not repeal this proviso because such action might give rise to trouble in the future. Well, we have had no trouble in the past, Mr. Speaker, when we had a board appointed under order in council only by the province of Ontario and by the Dominion government. It was not because the commissioners were quarrelling that the legislation was passed in 1921; it was simply to give them the necessary authority to control the waters of the Lake of the Woods and of the rivers mentioned. It cannot be said that the commission is of no value because it consists of four members and that they may not always agree. We can at any time make a change so far as the commission is concerned; we can provide that the quorum shall consist of three members; that the chairman shall have a double vote, and so on. That is only a question of detail. If this bill becomes law and it is found next year or in subsequent years that the board is not operating in the interests of the provinces of Manitoba and of Ontario and of Canada as a whole, we can at any time again declare these works for the general advantage of Canada. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the country; for the good of the province of Manitoba; for the protection of those who have invested millions in these powers on the Winnipeg river, I say we should pass this legislation. We are told by the members for Manitoba that they will be satisfied to let the bill pass provided that it is proclaimed only with the consent of Manitoba. We only ask our hon. friends to trust us in that respect. The government of Canada can only be satisfied if the province of Manitoba is satisfied, because the rights of Manitoba are the rights of the Dominion. These resources, these powers, these waters are under the control of the Dominion; why should we sacrifice any of our property in favour of one province as against another. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal we put before the House in this matter is in the interests of the province of Manitoba as well as of the Dominion as a whole, and I hope that the measure will be accepted by the House.

The House divided on the motion of Sir Lomer Gouin which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Benoit,	Kay,
Binette,	Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
Boivin,	King (Kootenay),
Bouchard,	Lanctôt,
Boucher,	Lapointe,
Bourassa,	Leger,
Bureau,	Lovett,
Cardin,	Macdonald (Pictou),
Casgrain,	McBride,
Chevrier,	McGiverin,
Copp,	McIsaac,
d'Anjou,	McTaggart,
Déchêne,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Delisle,	Marcile (Bagot),
Denis (St. Denis),	Michaud,
Descoteaux,	Morrissy,
Deslauriers,	Munro,
Desrochers,	Ouimet,
Duff,	Parent,
Fontaine,	Pelletier,
Forrester,	Putnam,
Gauvreau,	Reed,
Gervais,	Rinfret,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Robb,
Graham,	Sexsmith,
Halbert,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Hammell,	Tobin,
Hatfield,	Wallace—57.
Hodgins,	

NAYS

Messrs:

Arthurs,	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Bancroft,	Leader,
Baxter,	Lovie,
Beaubien,	McConica,
Bird,	McMurray,
Davies,	Ryckman,
Duncan,	Sales,
Forke,	Shaw,
Gardiner,	Spence,
Garland (Bow River),	Steedsman,
Hoey,	Stevens,
Hubbs,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Hudson,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Humphrey,	Stewart (Leeds),
Irvine,	Ward,
Jones,	Woodsworth—32.

PAIRS

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs:

Kyte,	Boys,
Desaulniers,	Wilson,
Sinclair,	Tolmie,
Gendron,	Garland (Carleton),
Fielding,	Drayton,
Maclean (Halifax),	Guthrie,
Fournier,	Hanson.

Mr. DESAULNIERS: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson); otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GENDRON: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Garland); otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. FIELDING: I was paired with the hon. member for West York. I do not know how I might have voted. What I mean is I think probably the hon. member and I would have agreed, but in his absence I have not voted.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens, P.E.I.): I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria. Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

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

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

Mr. HUDSON: I would ask that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be taken up to-morrow.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Why not?

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

WAYS AND MEANS

SALES TAX

The House in committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the Chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and amending acts and to provide:

3. That the existing provisions respecting tax on sales be amended by providing for the imposition of a consumption or sales tax of six per centum on the sale price of all goods produced or manufactured in Canada, including the amount of excise duties when the goods are sold in bond, the tax to be payable by the producer or manufacturer at the time of the sale thereof by him, and of a like tax upon the duty paid value of imported goods, the tax to be payable by the importer, or transferee who takes the goods out of bond, at the time when the goods are imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption, subject to the following conditions, that is to say:

Mr. FIELDING: The essence of this proposal is that we adopt one general sales tax instead of the varying rates which were hitherto in force. I may say the aim of the resolution is not to raise additional revenue, though it may produce some, by overcoming the evasions of the past. If it brings us more revenue we shall find it very welcome, but that is not the object. The object is to simplify the sales tax. Instead of having varying rates we have one tax of 6 per cent which will apply practically everywhere. That is the underlying principle. The machinery by which it is worked out is not without some difficulty, but the officials of the Customs department assure me it is quite workable. I think with that explanation the committee will understand all that is involved in the resolution.

Mr. BAXTER: I have had representations, and I have no doubt the minister also has had, from people in the lumber business, who point out that this will seriously affect them. I received a telegram on the subject from a large manufacturer to-day. Messrs. Haley of St. John also called my attention to the fact that the stocks they carry would not be used up until a much later period than that at which the change goes into effect. I would therefore ask the minister, I have no doubt he has had representations on the matter, as to whether he will be prepared to make some modification to cover cases of that kind?

Mr. FIELDING: The bill which will be introduced deals more in detail with the matter, and I think I am safe in saying that as to the time referred to the criticism of the hon. gentleman can be met. The bill will contain all the details, and if it is agreeable to the House instead of going into an argument about it to-night the resolution might be passed, the bill founded on it introduced, and the whole matter then remain over for further consideration. I think it will be found later that the particular point in question has been met.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will that apply to all the purchases of lumbermen throughout the Dominion?

Mr. FIELDING: The tax will apply to the lumbermen at the first stage.

Mr. STEVENS: Then we are to understand that any matter coming up in this resolution can be discussed when the bill is brought forward?

Mr. FIELDING: Quite so.

Motion agreed to.

(1) A manufacturer or producer who produces goods to the value of ten thousand dollars or more during any fiscal year shall take out an annual license, the fee therefor not to exceed two dollars; the Minister may direct that a manufacturer or producer, who does not manufacture or produce goods to the value of ten thousand dollars a year, and who uses a substantial portion of goods which are exempt from the tax in the manufacture of goods which are liable to the tax, shall take out a license and shall be subject to the same conditions as the licensed manufacturer or producer.

(2) A wholesaler or jobber who sells not less than thirty per cent of his total sales of goods to a licensed manufacturer or producer to be used in articles to be produced for sale, may be granted an annual license, the fee therefor not to exceed two dollars. Such licensed wholesaler or jobber shall give security that he will keep proper accounts and render true statements of sales to licensed manufacturers or producers and pay any tax imposed by the said act.

Mr. FIELDING: I move to amend subsection 2. The amendment is to strike out the word "thirty" in the first line and substitute the word "fifty". The first two lines will then read:

A wholesaler or jobber who sells not less than fifty per cent of his total sales of goods to a licensed manufacturer or producer—

And so on.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: The other sections are unchanged until we come down to resolution No. 5:

(5) The said consumption or sales tax shall not be payable in the following cases, that is to say:

(c) on goods imported by a licensed manufacturer or producer to be used in the production of articles for sale; or

Mr. FIELDING: There is no change down to resolution No. 5. I move that paragraph (c) subsection 5, of resolution 3, of May 11th be struck out. It is provided for in another part of the resolution.

Amendment agreed to.

(d) on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to, or on goods imported by, a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for in accordance with the provisions of paragraph two of section three of this resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: I move that paragraph (d) of subsection 5 of the resolution be amended by striking out the words: "on goods imported by."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I want to put in a new section No. 7, as follows:

A deduction from the consumption or sales tax may be granted in respect of goods imported by a licensed manufacturer or producer when such goods are further manufactured and liable to the consumption or sales tax, such deduction not to exceed the amount of the said tax paid on importation.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Fielding.]

(7) A refund of the amount of the said consumption or sales tax may be granted in the following cases, that is to say:

(a) to a wholesaler, jobber or other dealer on goods sold to a licensed manufacturer or producer to be used in articles produced for sale; or with the consent of the wholesaler, jobber or dealer a refund or deduction may in the like case be granted to a licensed manufacturer or producer; or

Mr. FIELDING: Then I move that paragraph (a) subsection 7 of the resolution be amended by inserting at the beginning of the said paragraph the words:

(a) To a licensed manufacturer or producer; or

The numbering will be changed. What was 7 now becomes 8.

Amendment agreed to.

Item agreed to.

(b) to a licensed manufacturer or producer or a licensed wholesaler or jobber, in respect of goods on hand on the 1st of August, 1923, and which are to be used in the production of articles for sale, no refund to be allowed in respect of goods on hand after the 31st of December, 1923; or

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move that paragraph (c) of subsection 7 of the resolution be amended so that it will read as follows:

To a licensed manufacturer or producer or a licensed wholesaler or jobber in respect of goods on hand on the 1st day of January 1924 and which are to be used in the production of articles for sale, no refund to be allowed in respect of goods not accounted for prior to the 31st day of March, 1924.

Amendment agreed to.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: The lettering will be changed to correspond; (b) becomes (c), and (c) becomes (d), (d) becomes (e) and (e) becomes (f). Number 8 becomes 9.

On subsection 9, paragraph 5:

5. That Schedule II, to the said act be amended by striking thereout the item respecting beverages and by adding to the said schedule the following item:

"Carbonic acid gas in cylinders per pound, one cent."

Mr. FIELDING: There is an item respecting beverages and carbonic acid gas. I had the impression we passed it, but there was a motion to strike out the words "in cylinders," which I think has been overlooked. I will ask you therefore to open up the item and strike out the words "in cylinders."

Amendment agreed to.

Item agreed to.

4. That the said resolutions be amended by striking out resolution No. 7 and by adding thereto the following resolutions:—

"7. A deduction on account of the sales tax may be granted in respect to goods sold at a price fixed by bona fide contract of sale made before the twelfth day of May, 1923, and still in force at the time of delivery of the goods; provided that such deduction

shall not exceed the difference between the amount of the sales tax calculated at the rate in force on the eleventh day of May, 1923, and the amount of the consumption or sales tax paid or to be payable under the provisions of these resolutions, and that no such deduction shall be made in respect of goods delivered after the thirty-first day of March, 1924, and claims for such deduction must be presented to the Department of Customs and Excise with complete evidence on or before the 30th day of June, 1924, otherwise the same shall be rejected."

Mr. FIELDING: These resolutions were supplemented by resolutions of the 23rd May, to which I will draw attention. I move the adoption of this resolution.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: Resolutions 8, 9 and 10 have been passed I understand. There is a change of words in these resolutions; but they do not alter the general purpose as I have stated.

Mr. STEVENS: While the minister is on the adjustment I should like to draw attention to something which I think is an oversight. In clause 9, page 3, the words "earthen drain tiles for agricultural purposes" are used. It has been represented to me that a lot of drain tiles used for draining farms are made of concrete or cement, just the same as the earthen tiles exactly, made in the locality and used very extensively, particularly in western Ontario. An hon. member drew this to my attention, and asked that the word "earthen" be dropped.

Mr. FIELDING: It would not cover cement tiles, if that is what my hon. friend means. Would he like cement to be included?

Mr. STEVENS: Or leave it "drain tiles for agricultural purposes."

Mr. FIELDING: Then strike out the word "earthen" and leave it "drain tiles." I will move that amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I move the following resolution:

"10.That said paragraph 4 of subsection (1) of section nineteen BBB of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, being the list of excepted articles not liable to tax, be amended by adding thereto the following item:—

'syrups enumerated in Customs Tariff item 140;' "

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I move the following, resolution as No. 12:

That any enactment founded on resolutions Nos. 4 and 5, shall come into force on the 1st day of June, 1923; and any enactment founded on resolutions Nos 1 and 6 of the resolutions of May 11th, 1923, shall come into force on the 1st day of August, 1923 and any enactment founded on resolutions Nos. 3, 7, 8 and 10 shall come into force on the 1st day of January, 1924.

You will see these are all set out fully in the bill, and they can be better understood then.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 230, to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Thursday).

Thursday, June 21, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

QUEBEC SAVINGS BANK ACT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 231, to amend the Quebec Savings Bank Act, 1913.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 226 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Conkey.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 227 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Marie Pope.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 228 (from the Senate), for the relief of Loretta May Girard.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 229 (from the Senate), for the relief of Birdena Frances Wallace LeMay.—Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DISMISSAL OF JAMES CONLEY

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. Why was James Conley dismissed from the position of keeper of Noel Light on Noel wharf, Hants county, Nova Scotia?

2. Upon whose recommendation was the dismissal made, and upon whose recommendation was his successor appointed?

3. At the time of making the dismissal, or subsequently, was the Department of Marine and Fisheries aware that Conley had permission from the Inspector of lights to have the light attended to by his wife during his absence?

4. What was then, and is now, the remuneration for keeping said light?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. He was dismissed on the ground that he did not attend to the duties of lightkeeper, contrary to the rule and practice of the department.

2. The dismissal and appointment were made on the recommendation of the Hon. Jacques Bureau, at the time Acting Minister of the department.

3. Subsequent to the dismissal of Conley, the department was informed that he had permission from the Inspector of Lights. The inspector, however, had no authority to vary any rule or practice.

4. Conley was receiving $150 per annum. His successor is receiving $120 per annum.

METAPEDIA BRIDGE

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. How much lumber was used in the repairs to the Interprovincial Bridge at Metapedia, Quebec, last fall?

2. (a) Who supplied same, (b) what was the price per thousand feet, and (c) the total amount paid for the lumber?

3. What men worked on the bridge, at what wages and for what time were they respectively paid?

4. (a) What men hauled the lumber, (b) at what wages per day for horse and man, and (c) what was the total amount paid for this service?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. 30,385 feet.

2. (a) Chas. H. Nadeau and Jas. H. Adams; (b) $25 per M. feet; (c) $759.63.

3. S. M. Adams, conductor $4 a day, 21 days in November, 6 in December; Jas. H. Adams, sub-conductor, $3 a day, 21 days in November, 6 in December; D. F. Adams, labourer, $3 a day, 20 days in November, 6 in December; Alex. Gallant, labourer, $2.50 a day, 19 days in November, 5 in December; Herbert Adams, labourer, $2.50 a day, 16 days in November, 6 in December; John Firter, labourer, $2.50 a day, 8 days in November, 6 in December; Malcolm Lawlor, labourer, $3 a day, 1 day in November; Octave Gallant, labourer, $2.50 a day, 1 day in November; John A. Adams, labourer, $2.50 a day, 6 days in November.

4. (a) Gordon Lawlor and D. F. Adams; (b) $4 a day to Lawlor for 17½ days, and $4.50 a day to Adams for 1 day; (c) $74.50.

WOOLLEN INDUSTRY IN CANADA

Mr. CHURCH:

Is it intended to introduce any legislation this session to assist the woollen industry in Canada?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: No legislation with special reference to the woollen industry is proposed.

[Mr. Fielding.]

CATTLE EMBARGO—INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to ask again if the correspondence requested yesterday, and which was ordered on February 12th, regarding the removal of the cattle embargo, is ready yet for presentation to the House?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not personally familiar with the matter. I will inquire of the Minister of Agriculture and ascertain during the day.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House do this day resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, chapter ten of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by providing—

1. That the present sessional allowance of members of the Senate and House of Commons shall be paid to every member of either House who attends a session of Parliament extending over a period of fifty days or more; that a member shall not be entitled to the sessional allowance for less than fifty days' attendance but that his allowance for any less number of days shall be twenty-five dollars for each day's attendance; and that the said allowance may be paid on the last day of each month to the extent of twenty dollars per day for each day's attendance;

2. That a deduction at the rate of twenty-five dollars per day shall be made from such sessional allowance for every day beyond fifteen on which the member does not attend a sitting of the House, if the House sits on that day; provided that in the case of a member elected or appointed after the commencement of a session, no day of the session previous to such election or appointment shall be reckoned as one of such fifteen days, and that each day during the session on which there has been no sitting of such House in consequence of its having adjourned over such day, shall be reckoned as a day of attendance at such session, for the purpose of the indemnity; and

3. That the above amendments with the exception of that concerning the payment of the indemnity on the last day of each month at the rate of twenty dollars per day, shall apply to the present session of Parliament.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

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

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Before the resolution is reported I should like to ask if the purport is to permit the bringing in of a bill to remove some of the restrictions that formerly existed? For example, I understand

there was a regulation that if a member were absent any day during the last fifteen days of the session he was fined $25 for that day's absence. Does the bill to be founded on this resolution remove that restriction?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I understand that it does.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then I wish to protest. I shall vote against the resolution.

An hon. MEMBER: Very good.

Mr. RINFRET: You do not have to take the money.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 232, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On the motion of Mr. Fielding for the second reading:

Mr. SHAW: I wish to make one or two observations at this time. In so far as this bill proposes to lift the restrictions which were imposed, as I believe for very good reasons I am opposed to it. In so far as it proposes to clarify the situation, I have no objection

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. FIELDING thereupon moved that the House go into committee of the whole upon the bill.

Mr. GARDINER: Is this bill printed and distributed?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know whether it is distributed. I have a printed copy.

Mr. GARDINER: I desire to protest against the bill proceeding any further until it has been distributed.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. member objects, the bill will have to stand, and we will take the second reading to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: The second reading has taken place now by common consent.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member objects

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for the second reading has been carried, and it has been moved that I do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GARDINER: I desire to enter a protest.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is not debatable, according to rule 17A. The hon. member will have plenty of opportunity to object when the bill is in committee.

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

On section 1—Sessional allowance and allowance for attendance less than 50 days.

Mr. GARDINER: I still desire to enter an emphatic protest against considering this bill or any bill, until such time as the bill has been printed and distributed to the members of the House. I will, therefore, move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. BOIVIN: I wish to say—

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is not debatable.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. member seriously objects to the motion, I will not press it any further to-day.

Mr. GARDINER: I object to the motion, and I object to the principle that members of this House should be called upon to consider bills which are not printed and not in the hands of members; because we should have an opportunity of considering the details.

Mr. FIELDING: I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

LAKE OF THE WOODS REGULATION

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the third reading of Bill No. 175, to repeal The Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921.

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

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONSTRUCTION

On motion of Hon. Geo. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the construction of Canadian National Railway lines, and to provide,—

1. That the Governor in Council may provide for the construction and completion by the Canadian National Railway Company (hereinafter called "the

Company") of the lines of railway mentioned or referred to in the schedule to these resolutions (hereinafter called "the said lines of railway");

2. That any of the said lines of railway connecting with the Canadian Government Railways may be declared by the Governor in Council to form part of the Canadian Government Railways. Lines of railway so declared (hereinafter called "Government Railway lines") shall be constructed by the company on behalf of His Majesty and the company shall cause the title to the necessary lands or interests in lands to be acquired in the name of His Majesty.

3. That with respect to Government Railway lines the Governor in Council may authorize advances to be made to the company from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to cover the necessary expenditure in acquiring such lands or interests in lands and in constructing and completing such lines of railway.

4. That with respect to the lines of railway mentioned or referred to in the said schedule other than Government Railway lines (which other lines are hereinafter referred to as "National Railway lines") the Governor in Council may authorize the guarantee of the principal and interest of the securities of the company issued under the provisions (save as herein varied) of section 26 of chapter 13 of the statutes of 1919, to an amount approved by the Governor in Council but not exceeding $40,000 per mile of such National Railway lines.

5. That the certificate of the minister as to the mileage of the National Railway lines shall for these purposes be conclusive, but the minister may issue interim certificates from time to time based upon the estimated mileage and a final certificate to accord with the miles and fractions of miles actually constructed, each line of railway being treated as a separate line.

6. That the mileage of the said lines of railway and the cost of construction thereof mentioned in the schedule hereto shall be deemed to be merely estimated distances and costs.

7. That the nature and form of securities to be issued and guaranteed shall be approved by the Governor in Council and signed by the Minister of Finance, and may, as the Governor in Council decides, be secured by mortgage or deed of trust.

8. That to enable the work of construction and completion of the National Railway lines to proceed forthwith the Governor in Council, pending the issue and disposal of such guaranteed securities, may authorize advances to be made to the company from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, such advances to be reimbursed to His Majesty by the company from the proceeds of the sale or disposition of such guaranteed securities.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On clause 1:

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to make an explanation. The suggestion was made last night by the hon. member for Vancouver in reference to another bill that the resolutions might be allowed to go through their formal course, and that we should get these resolutions in the shape of a bill, so that every member could have it in his hands. I have a bill drafted on these resolutions. If the House would consent, we would get these resolutions in the form of a bill, and then let the matter stand for two or three days, till each member has a copy of the bill and can look over it.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

Mr. HANSON: When does the minister suggest that consideration should be given to the bill?

Mr. GRAHAM: Very soon, for the simple reason that when we go into the details of the bill it will be necessary to have some members of the staff from Montreal here.

Mr. HANSON: I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest that the consideration of the bill be taken up on Monday, if that is agreeable to the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: No objection.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I do not desire to object to proceeding with the resolution, but I wish to draw the attention of the government, and the Minister of Railways more especially, to the fact that they are going into an expenditure of about $25,000,000 for the construction of branch lines. I scanned the resolution very rapidly, and I observed that 71 miles are located in Nova Scotia, 25 miles in New Brunswick, 14 miles in Quebec, and 29 miles in Ontario, and all the rest goes to the west. I do not object that the proposal be adopted. I have had the honour of representing my constituency for twenty-five years, and his Honour the Speaker (Mr. Lemieux) has represented Gaspé, the adjoining constituency, for a longer period. We have on several occasions called the attention of governments in the past to the singular position in which the people of the Gaspé peninsula are situated. In twelve years from now the four-hundredth anniversary of the landing of Jacques Cartier on Canadian soil will occur in this the oldest-inhabited part of Canada. And we are still asking for a decent railway service. When Sir Wilfred Laurier took office in 1896, one hundred miles of railway had been built, as far as New Carlisle, following out a proposal made to the parliament of that day by Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Charles Tupper in 1882. Sir Hector Langevin at that time was Minister of Public Works and leader in the province of Quebec, Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways. In 1882, parliament voted an amount for the construction of this branch of the Intercolonial railway from Matapedia towards Gaspé Basin. This undertaking was handed over to a private company, and the misfortunes of that district began with that date. Sir Wilfred Laurier took office in 1896, and the present Speaker of this House asked, very fairly for his constituency—because at that time Gaspé was the only constituency in Quebec which

had no railway service whatever—that the line should be continued from New Carlisle to Gaspé. The remaining one hundred miles were completed, making in all two hundred miles of railway. The late Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) had a law passed through this House by which any two hundred miles of railway connecting with the Intercolonial or with government-owned railways might be merged into the Canadian National system. We have urged this for many years without success. The present two hundred miles of railway line are owned by two companies, the shareholders of which reside in England. They give service merely to keep the railway alive, and the result is that that part of Quebec, which is the most interesting from its maritime aspect, from its valuable resources, from the attractiveness of its territory and from its very energetic population, has remained to this date the most poorly served part of Canada in the matter of railways. It seems strange to these people, inhabiting the oldest part of Canada, while we are voting millions for new parts of Canada which are barely settled at the present time, or which are yet to be settled by newcomers to this country whom we welcome—that the oldest settlers, the people of the oldest part of Canada, should remain still without any adequate railway service.

Lately we have called the attention of Sir Henry Thornton to this state of affairs. Sir Henry Thornton volunteered to have an inspection made of these lines and to have them operated as if they were the property of the Dominion, as branch lines of the Intercolonial railway, because they are de facto branch lines of that road. The two counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure are inhabited by 60,000 people, and we could easily have three times that population if we had a proper railway service. These two constituencies cover 10,000 square miles of the most fertile territory in the province of Quebec, with a double advantage of being situated by the sea, having thousands of miles of timber and pulpwood, mineral resources, fertile soil, and splendid fisheries producing some of the finest fish of the North American continent. Our rivers are visited yearly by the cream of American and Canadian society, from His Excellency down, and that has been the case for the last forty years. A member of the Royal House has gone to the extent of establishing a residence at New Richmond to take advantage of the fisheries in these attractive regions. Nevertheless the district has remained in a quiescent state. During the first ten years that I had the honour of representing the constituency in this House, the population increased in one county alone by 5,000. During the next decade, from 1911 to 1921, the population increased by only 500. Why? Because the industries in both Gaspé and Bonaventure, one after another moved away across the Baie des Chaleurs to the Intercolonial where they could get service over which they could send their produce. At Nouvelle, to begin with, the Province of Quebec Lumber Association transferred all its lumber over to Dalhousie, and it is operating on the main line of the Intercolonial. The same thing happened at Bonaventure and New Richmond where the mills of the McLean Lumber Corporation were transferred to Bathurst, and to-day we witness the spectacle of this lumber being cut in these two countries and being transported in booms across the Baie des Chaleurs, a distance ranging from 25 to 50 miles to be sawn and placed on board cars to be exported to the Canadian and American markets at great disadvantage and loss. The result of this is that the young people are leaving these two counties daily, and settling, unfortunately a large number of them, in the United States. We are losing our population, and this because we have not an efficient railway service which would develop the resources of these two constituencies as they should be developed. I know the Minister of Railways or the government has handed over the operation of the Canadian National Railways to a board of directors. Sir Henry Thornton is willing to operate these lines as branches of the Intercolonial. We find ourselves in presence of these two companies holding these roads for a price, and between the two the people are not getting the service. There must be a solution to this, and I wish to attract the attention of the Minister of Railways and the government of Canada to this fact. Hon. Mr. Carvell and some of his associates on the Railway Commission visited the constituencies two or three years ago and made an elaborate report, which is now in the possession of the Minister of Railways, pointing out that these two constituencies did not have the railway service to which they were entitled. And if an application were made to the Railway Commission to-morrow, I have no doubt that an order would be issued which would place these two English companies in the position of having to give up the operation of these railways, because I understand their resources are not sufficient to give the country the service to which it is entitled.

We have on these two roads some very antiquated locomotives. We have no rolling stock whatever. The rolling stock that we have comes from other roads, and still every pound of freight and every passenger coming over these 200 miles of territory cannot reach any other railway than the Intercolonial. After the hon. the Speaker had succeeded in having the second hundred miles of this road completed, I had the honour of introducing in this House in 1904 a bill to authorize the contruction of the interprovincial railway bridge over the Restigouche river between Cross Point and Campbellton, the reason at that time being to link up these two railways with the Intercolonial Railway at Campbellton. We have now communication with Matapedia by which we can easily reach Montreal, Quebec, Ontario and the West. But our communication with the American market and with the Maritime provinces is defective. By the construction of this bridge over the Restigouche river between Quebec and New Brunswick, we would have an easy access to these railways, to the Intercolonial going east and west, to the International running from Campbellton to St. Leonards and the border of the state of Maine, where it would connect with the American system of railways and would place the entire Gaspé Peninsula within 24 hours of Boston, the great fish market of the United States. We have in the Baie des Chaleurs some of the most magnificent fish in the province. We have pulpwood galore. We have untold wealth in minerals. We have all these resources, but we need a much better railway service. Before the Minister of Railways proceeds much further with this railway legislation, I trust he will give this state of affairs his serious consideration. He will find in the archives of his department a very elaborate report issued last year by one of his officials, Mr. Fraser, who went down there and made a thorough investigation into the whole system. In this report Mr. Fraser points out that these 200 miles are the most valuable branch of the Intercolonial east of Montreal. Still they are inadequately unoperated, the people have not the service, and the Canadian National Railways are without the proceeds that would be derived from the proper operation of these roads. We have a huge deficit in connection with our Canadian National Railways and the only way in which that deficit can be reduced is by obtaining business for the system. Here is an excellent opportunity. People are willing to stay at home here and are anxious to develop the place. We find here large families, and the people are not troubled with any advanced hour or any eight-hour-a-day system, nor are they bothered with labour unions. They are of the old type of Canadians who inhabited this country years ago. This is an ideal country for the development of all our industries and, as I have observed, there are large families—families of ten, twelve and fifteen children are frequent. We have lately seen at Gaspé itself the creation of a new diocese, which in the province of Quebec means the centre of a large district; and the absorbing powers of the French-Canadian race are strikingly exemplified in the fact that the first Roman Catholic bishop of this diocese is the Right Rev. Monseigneur Ross, the descendant of a Scotsman, though a French-Canadian himself. This part of the province of Quebec has thus become the nucleus of a new district, and when the Minister of Railways is considering this development of the National Railway system generally he will find a very notable example of what has occurred in the Lake St. John district as well as in the Chicoutimi district in the fact that this part of the province of Quebec has been erected into a diocese with a bishop in charge. He will also see in the Three Rivers district a section of the country that is fast becoming the industrial centre of the whole of Canada.

I am in favour of immigration, and during the past twenty-five years I have voted for the expenditure of millions untold for this purpose, for the construction of railways, and for the advancement of Canada generally. But really I consider that this part of the province of Quebec has been overlooked; and when His Honour the Speaker and myself placed the matter before Sir Henry Thornton on a purely business basis he was amazed at the state of affairs that actually existed. To such an extent, indeed, did it appeal to him that he offered at once to undertake the operation of these railways as branch lines of the Intercolonial. But we are held up by these English companies who are keeping the roads alive merely for the purpose of obtaining their price. Now, there must be a solution for this condition of things, and I call upon the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), who is familiar with the province of Quebec, his colleague, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), and the government, to provide this solution as soon as possible. We are not asking for the construction of railways; we are merely asking for the operation of a railway that has already been constructed, a portion of it forty years ago and the other portion within the last fifteen years. We simply want to give to the people the service to which they

are entitled; and that they are entitled to this service is admitted by the Railway Commission and all officials who have gone over the ground. I trust therefore that proper attention will be given this matter before long and that the people of Gaspé peninsula will receive that consideration which they have a right to expect at the hands of the country.

Mr. HANSON: I am sure the Minister of Railways must have a heart of stone if he does not give heed to the eloquence of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). While this subject is under consideration I want to call to his attention the position of a branch line of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the hon. member be kind enough to allow me just a few more words before he proceeds?

Mr. HANSON: I should rather like to continue; the topic I propose discussing is akin to the one just dealt with by my hon. friend. There is in the province of New Brunswick a line known as the Kent Northern railway, the only branch line in the province which has not been taken over by the Dominion. That line was included in the scheme projected by the Minister of Railways in the late government, and but for the attitude of the owners it would ere this have formed a part of the government railway system. I understand that the only difficulty in the old days was with regard to the price. The government at that time were willing to pay $60,000 for the twenty-eight miles of railway line, while the company that owned the property expected considerable more. It has lately come to my knowledge, however, that the company is now willing to sell at the offer originally made by the government, and I will ask that the Minister of Railways, while he is taking into consideration the appeal of the hon. member for Bonaventure, to give serious heed to the request of the people of the county of Kent in New Brunswick, that that line be taken over. During the recent very severe winter the people of that county, numbering some 25,000, were for forty-two days without railway communication. This is a great handicap to a part of the country, such as this is, that is well settled and is thriving industrially, besides being a considerable farming and fishing community. These people are entitled to a better service and the only possible means of providing such a service is for the government to take over this branch line. Again I ask the minister to take into earnest and serious consideration the question of acquiring that line.

Mr. CASGRAIN: While in opposition I took the opportunity on various occasions to call to the attention of the Minister of Railways the situation in regard to certain branch lines which were at that time needed in the county I have the honour to represent, the county of Charlevoix. These two branch lines extend respectively from Baie St. Paul to St. Urbain and from Murray Bay to Nairn fall. The distance between St. Paul and St. Urbain is nine miles and the line would cost approximately $200,000. I had the assurance of the Minister of Railways at that time, Hon. J. D. Reid, that he would send his engineers to look over the site with a view to seeing whether something could not be done in the immediate future. This, I might observe, was in the year 1920, or perhaps in 1921. There is a great mine operated by the Titanium Ore Company in this district; and the General Electric Company of the United States, during the war, successfully operated a mine next to it. I have no doubt that if proper facilities were afforded by a branch line the people that now own the capital stock of the Titanium Ore Company, and who belong to the province of Quebec would be able to carry on operations that would prove of great benefit to that district. At St. Urbain there is a national park which the Department of the Interior has set aside as a special reserve for fishing and hunting, while there are a great number of clubs under the control of the provincial government in this locality. As in the case of the county which my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) represents a great number of visitors from various parts of Canada, as well as from the United States, and indeed, from other parts of the province of Quebec, pass through this district of which I am speaking, every year, spring, summer and fall, and I am sanguine that if this branch line were built it would increase that traffic and bring more money and people to the place. This district is also a great farming centre, from which butter, cheese and other products are shipped to other parts of the province of Quebec. Then there is the other branch line to which I have referred, from Murray Bay to Nairn fall. It was constructed eleven years ago before the main line of the Saguenay railway was built. But up to the present time the government has not officially taken possession of it. The line has been leased for a nominal rental to a pulp company. I am informed that about $100,000 would put the line into proper shape. A great deal of cheese and butter

is produced in this district and extensive lumbering operations are carried on, so that there is plenty of freight business for the railway. Although the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and the new board of directors of the Canadian National Railways have apparently overlooked the transportation requirements of my district, I hope that they will take the matter once more into consideration and do something. There is also the completion of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway, to Chicoutimi from Murray Bay, a distance of about 55 miles, which has to be undertaken in the very near future if the main railway is to be made to pay. The previous government was very free with assurances that in the very near future they would do something for these people, but apparently these were merely election promises. I hope the new government will do better than their predecessors. To this end, I would extend to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals another invitation to visit this district next July, when I am sure they will agree with me that Baie St. Paul and Murray Bay for scenic beauty are not equalled anywhere else in the Dominion—in fact they will be charmed with the delightful county of Charlevoix-Montmorency.

Mr. LEGER: I can assure my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) that the railway in Kent was looked after by those more closely concerned in the interests of the county long before he was politically born. If we have not control of the branch lines down there it is not the fault of the Conservative government; they made an offer to the provincial authorities, which offer was declined. I for one have done all I could with reference to the matter, without bringing it before the House as a complaint against any government, and to-day it is being looked after by this government in a way which I think will be for the advantage of my county. I can assure my hon. friend that this business is in good hands and that we can get along fairly well without his interference.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Chairman, here is a very interesting situation for the Minister of Railways. The pathetic plea made by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has at least excited the sympathy of my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) because they have a fellow-feeling; they both have railways in their respective counties that have been built for forty years, operated by private companies during all that
4 p.m time, and now that these companies are unable to go on any longer my hon. friends want to dump the lines on to the government. They want to attach them to the National Railways, notwithstanding that my hon. friends from the province of Quebec are always complaining about our National Railway deficits. There is no hope of escaping these deficits—

Mr. VIEN: If my hon. friend will allow me—does he know that in the province of Quebec we have the shortest railway mileage per thousand of population in the whole Dominion, and that our railways always show a surplus?

Mr. HOCKEN: If there is a deficit on the National Railways it is not due to lack of traffic in the province of Ontario.

Mr. VIEN: Nor in Quebec, either.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not think my hon. friends will deny that in the province of Quebec there is a strong sentiment against government ownership and operation of railways, and I base my remarks upon that fact.

Mr. VIEN: If I might correct my hon. friend—the sentiment is much less strong since the new management took over the National Railways.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, and, to me, very satisfactory. It has really been worth while to have a change in the management if it has resulted in removing the antipathy to government ownership and operation of railways that formerly existed in the province of Quebec. With the hon. gentleman's province in favour of public ownership, I think we may safely say that the whole Dominion is favourable. So I am very glad to hear from my hon. friend of this change of sentiment in his province. I have a good deal of sympathy for my hon. friend from Bonaventure with his two hundred miles of railway built forty years ago and still in the hands of a private company. We are told, mostly by the press of the province of Quebec, including the Montreal Gazette, that the only way to run railways is by private ownership. Yet here is a railway in the beautiful county of Gaspé, a county of fertile soil and rich in natural resources, where the traffic is so light that no private capital can be induced to continue the operation of this forty-year-old road. Therefore what private capital has thrown aside parliament is urged to transfer to our National Railways. I am not taking the position that some relief should not be given to that beautiful county, but I just want to draw the attention of the House to the remarkable situation. Not only in the county

of Gaspé, but down in the province of New Brunswick there is a line that excites sympathy.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): The first part of the line I referred to was built forty years ago, the other part at a later date Every year there is a surplus on the first hundred miles of between $50,000 and $60,000, but on the second hundred miles there is always a deficit; so one practically balances the other. What we are urging the government to do is merely to give service on these branch lines that they give on the other branch lines of the Intercolonial Railway. Last September although four hundred cars were required only forty were received in the district, and of course this means that business is being lost. I merely want Sir Henry Thornton to operate these lines as if they were branches of the Intercolonial Railway The Dominion has spent a million dollars in subsidies, for which no results are being obtained.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is very interesting, too, but the fact still stands out that the private ownership of this railway has not been a success; and not being a success, my hon. friend turns to national ownership and wants the burden of this unsuccessful railway to be assumed by the National Railways.

Mr. VIEN: Was it not the same in respect to our National Railways?—that their unsuccessful operation under private ownership prompted my hon. friends to try government ownership?

Mr. HOCKEN: I see, Mr. Chairman, I have got myself into a lot of trouble in merely trying to elucidate a point which I thought it well to bring to the attention of the House. I may inform my hon. friend that it was the failure of private ownership, supported—unwisely supported, extravagantly supported—by the government of my hon. friends opposite which built the National Transcontinental.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who built the Grand Trunk?

Mr. HOCKEN: Who built the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not the government.

Mr. HOCKEN: The Grand Trunk Pacific never would have been built but for the support and assistance given by the government of that day.

Mr. GRAHAM: They all got support.

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes. I admit that private ownership failed. But not in the province of Ontario; it was always profitable there. It was when we went out into the West and built thousands of miles of railway through a wilderness that private ownership failed, and this country had to face the alternative of handing over to private corporations anywhere from fifty million to one hundred million dollars a year or else take over their failing railways. There was nothing else to do, as I see it, but to take over the system. My hon. friend has drawn me a little away from the point I was making. I am not raising any particular objection to the pathetic plea of my hon. friend from Bonaventure, but I wanted to point out the change that has taken place when the men who have been condemning private ownership now turn to public ownership to escape the burden that private ownership will not carry.

Mr. VIEN: Is there not a greater change in my hon. friend's attitude? He advocated public ownership when private ownership failed in his province and elsewhere, and he is now contending that we should not now carry out the same principle in respect to a railway in a province where the population per mile of railway is less than anywhere else in Canada. It is all very well to talk of public ownership in provinces where there is great density of population, but when it comes to assisting a certain branch line that cannot carry on by itself in the province of Quebec, where we have the smallest population per mile of railway, my hon. friend reverses his principles. He is opposed to the taking over of that railway by the National system, though he advocated the taking over of the railways in his own province and elsewhere that had failed under private ownership.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that this resolution deals with specific lines of railway, and the question whether public ownership or private ownership is the more profitable is really beyond the bounds of paragraph 1 and the schedule which forms a part of it.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend has made four speeches while I am on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN: I am simply informing the committee what I must rule in regard to this paragraph.

Mr. HOCKEN: You will permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend misrepresented my attitude absolutely. I thought

I had taken pains to say that I was not opposing what my hon. friend from Bonaventure asked. I did not oppose that.

Mr. VIEN: I did not understand you to approve of it.

Mr. HOCKEN: Perhaps I was not as clear as my hon. friend from Lotbiniere, but I tried to make it clear that I was not opposing it. I was drawing attention to this particular situation—

Mr. VIEN: Must we understand that you approve of it?

Mr. HOCKEN: The Chairman will be ruling you out of order.

Mr. VIEN: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Must we understand that my hon. friend is in favour of it?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am in favour of this: If the president of the National Railway says that this is something that ought to be done I think this parliament ought to listen with very careful attention and give fair consideration to his recommendation. The other fact to which I wish to draw attention—and I think I am within the rules in this, Mr. Chairman —is the generosity of the Minister of Railways towards our friends in western Canada. I think it was something like five million dollars that we voted for the Hudson Bay Railway. I find that this totals up an expenditure of $21,133,900 for railway extensions in western Canada.

Mr. FORKE: It is a paying proposition.

Mr. HOCKEN: It may be, but I doubt very much if it will pay for some time. And even if it is a paying proposition I want to point out that the Minister of Railways is very generous in his treatment of the West. I am not objecting to that.

Mr. FORKE: It is good business.

Mr. HOCKEN: But I say that our friends in western Canada ought to feel grateful for it. They ought to go home and tell their friends that this parliament of Canada representing the effete East as well as the West is not unsympathetic with the men who are growing grain on the prairies.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Not so much so as the late government my hon. friend supported.

Mr. HOCKEN: I think that is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VIEN: You invited it.

[Mr. Hocken.]

Mr. HOCKEN: Because if I attempted to answer it I am afraid I should take all afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot prevent interjections if the hon. member does not object to them.

Mr. HOCKEN: You know, Mr. Chairman, that I am not accustomed to wasting the time of the House, but I could make a defence of the late government particularly in its treatment of the West. I say that over $21,000,000 is to be spent for railway construction in western Canada, and if you include the Hudson Bay Railway it is nearly $27,000,000; and only $7,276,000 is to be spent in all the rest of Canada. I want my friends from the West to go home and tell their constituents that this parliament is just as anxious for the prosperity of the West as the men who are growing grain on the prairies, and we are proving it by voting this large sum for railway extensions in that part of the country. I do not object to the cost because I conclude—

Mr. FORKE: May I ask a question? Does the hon. member realize that the city of Toronto will benefit more by the extension of these railway lines than the people living in the West?

Mr. HOCKEN: No, I do not realize that at all, but I realize this, that of the money that will be spent in this direction the city of Toronto will pay more than any other part of the country.

Mr. FORRESTER: Where do they get it?

Mr. CASGRAIN: What about Montreal?

Mr. HOCKEN: Montreal will also contribute. Every large centre of population and of industry and wealth will pay its share.

Mr. FORKE: Where do they get the wealth?

Mr. HOCKEN: I might tell my hon. friend this, but I am afraid I am out of order, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Toronto and the city of Montreal were flourishing and prosperous before there was any West. Their prosperity may have been increased by the West.

Mr. FORRESTER: You were only a camp of gypsies.

Mr. HOCKEN: I think my hon. friend is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am trying to point out to my hon. friends from the West and to this

House with what generosity they are being treated in the matter of railway construction. When they charge the constituency I represent with deriving the greater part of the profit from such extensions as this, I say that is not the case. The city of Toronto, the city of Montreal, and all the big cities in this country are the tax-paying centres of Canada.

Mr. FORRESTER: Rats!

Mr. HOCKEN: Somebody said "rats." Look at the tax returns and especially the income tax and sales tax returns, the post office and custom house and all the rest of it, and what I say will be proven. This government derives its money, and its collection is made easy, because of the concentration of wealth in those cities.

Mr. FORKE: What about that four hundred million bushels of wheat from the West?

Mr. HOCKEN: That contributes a great deal to the prosperity of the railways, but it also contributes to the prosperity of the men who grow the wheat. My attitude in this House has always been, and is now, that the best thing that parliament can do for the West is to improve its transportation, and that is what we are doing. The only way you can get more money for your grain and obtain lower rates is to improve the railway and all other forms of transportation. I just rose for two purposes and I have been drawn over several different concession lines until I have diverted from those purposes. I wanted to point out to people interested in public ownership throughout this Dominion—not only in Ontario and the West, but also in the province which up to the present time has not been very sympathetic towards that policy—that the West is getting a tremendous railway expenditure of $27,000,000.

Mr. FORKE: That was a business proposition, to the advantage of Canada, and the city of Toronto would benefit from this expenditure as well as the West.

Mr. HOCKEN: That may be true, but I wonder if my hon. friend disputes the logic of my statement. Are we spending $27,000,000 in the West or are we not?

Mr. FORKE: We have not spent it yet.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is that not what is proposed and are you not going to vote for it?

Mr. FORKE: I am not in the witness box yet.

Mr. HOCKEN: Then my hon. friend does not know whether he is going to vote for it or not.

Mr. FORKE: Indeed he does.

Mr. HOCKEN: I venture the guess that he will vote for it. Now, what I hope is that the members of this House who represent western constituencies—and I believe since they came here they have changed their viewpoint as to what the attitude of the East is towards the West—will tell their friends when they go home that there is nothing the parliament of Canada is more deeply interested in than contributing to the prosperity of the western part of this Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I only intend to speak for two or three minutes and I do not propose to say anything about public ownership as against private ownership other than this: The people have before them to-day evidence of the development of the Canadian National system, which is based on public ownership, and in which system they are the shareholders. If you wish to see a further illustration of the success of public ownership look at the local street railway in Toronto and the development of power distribution in the province of Ontario. Then wait for the verdict of the people of the province in that respect on Monday next.

I want to deal with a matter of railway service which has apparently been ignored in the proposal before the House. In the province of Ontario it is proposed to spend nearly $2,000,000 on the Lac line which connects the Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental railway, and effects a great economy in the consumption of coal alone representing a saving of millions of capital. I thoroughly approve of the vote for this purpose and I am glad to see the item in the estimates.

Mr. HOCKEN: It will improve transportation from the east to the west and from the west to the east.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): It is in reality a work for the general advantage of Canada and I am glad to see a vote for this purpose. I should also like to see the present management of the Canadian National Railways take up and carry out improvements in connection with their system at Toronto which would involve a comparatively small expenditure. Toronto believes in public ownership and supports it, and yet obstacles still exist to the complete unification of the government railways running into that city. The old Grand Trunk, the old Canadian Northern,

and the "new National," as it is termed, have been consolidated. An evidence of that is given in the connection proposed with the Long Lac lines. But Toronto would like to see the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways entering that city under better conditions than now prevail. The two tracks entering the city by the east are four miles apart and the grades are over one per cent. Between the two tracks there was discovered some years ago a grade of one-half of one per cent which ought to be used. This could be done at very small expenditure, and I was under the impression there would have been provision made this year for that purpose. It would help to put the new station at Toronto, which represents an expenditure of four or five million dollars into use for it is not in use yet. The reason for the delay, I presume, is that the president and managing board of the National Railways have not yet prepared an estimate to lay before the government for the unification of the National lines running into Toronto. While an expenditure of four or five million dollars might be involved—perhaps a little more—the saving in the consumption of coal alone, in the overcoming of grades and the taking of a whole lot of traffic from the front of the city across town and farther to the north, would be so great, and would facilitate the economical handling of business to such an extent, that it would be worth, I imagine, three times the expense which may be involved. Therefore I would like to suggest to the minister—not that I hold him absolutely responsible for the administration of the National roads at the present time, seeing that the administration is now in the hands of the new president and his co-directors—the necessity of drawing the attention of the new management to that condition of affairs, and to ask for improvement there even though it necessitate a considerable expenditure. Because, as I have pointed out, the economies and benefits to be gained would more than compensate for the expenditure in question, I hope, therefore, the Minister of Railways will take an early opportunity of bringing to the attention of the board of management the statements I make here to-day. Probably the minister knows more about the situation than the directors do because he is cognizant of what has occurred in the past. And there may be other parts of the country where similar improvements can be carried out. The unification of the system of railways that we have taken over has not been accomplished yet. There are a great many places where improvements like that proposed at Long Lac can be carried out at comparatively small expense and the great saving in the upkeep to say nothing of the improvement in the service would more than pay for the outlay in the course of three or four years. Unification is certainly most desirable in connection with the National railway system in the city of Toronto. At present there is an agitation going on rather to the discredit of the National system of railways. The public press are taking the matter up now and are wanting to know why the new union station—in reality it is not new it is five years old—has not been used. I hope the minister will draw the attention of the president and the board of management to this situation. Perhaps there will be an item in the supplementary estimates yet to be brought in that will make provision for this purpose. If that proves to be the case the government and the administration of the National road will be taking a still further step towards earning the appreciation of the people of the country.

As to what my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has said here to-day in regard to the local railway in his constituency —and I imagine that he is also expressing the views of the present Speaker (Mr. Lemieux) in regard to the railway condition in Gaspé—the situation referred to ought to be cured. Perhaps it will be cured by the installation of gasoline engines capable of drawing passengers cars as well as freight cars. This will be a great advance in transportation in that district. I notice that the Canadian National Railway board is taking up that matter in various parts of Canada and perhaps relief may be found in that direction. While I do not want to interfere in any way with the freedom which has been given to the president and directorate of the National system in dealing with the railway question, I think no mistake is made in drawing the attention of the House, as well as the board of management, to the railway grievance that exists in Toronto and to the need for improvements which will effect a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in the maintenance charges, greatly assist the movement of traffic, help the development of Toronto, and make the investment we have made in these railways a striking success.

And this is all the more in favour of public ownership as against private ownership, and probably I have a right to bring it up now. I repeat what I said the other day, that company ownership has been an absolute failure in the United States. There is no provision for the recovery of the privately-owned companies and railways in the United States, except the intervention of the

national government and the payment of immense subsidies to them for the reconstruction, electrification and re-equipment of the company-owned railways in that country. They have absolutely failed in the United States, the people there have no longer faith in them, and the only relief ahead of them, as far as I can see is public ownership. We shall hear the announcement in the speeches which will be made by President Harding when he goes to the people—as he intends to go to them on the railway question almost in the next few days—that private ownership has failed. The New York Central railway and the Pennsylvania railway have failed. They cannot finance for reconstruction, electrification, or re-equipment.

Referring to my hon. friends from Quebec, I do not propose to say anything offensive to them, but I will compliment them on getting behind the movement for the nationalization of the railways and the improvement of the railways in the direction of giving the people better transportation facilities, especially in connection with the waterways. We have not only to regulate the railways and take them over, but we have to find the money to improve the waterways, and at the same time we must regulate the steamships which now use these waterways to levy unjust charges upon the people who use their system.

Mr. DAVIES: I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the railway branch line problem of this country, but I was rather constrained to speak for a moment because of some of the remarks of my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Hocken). From the tenor of his speech. I would say that he came from Toronto. I am not quite sure about that. He was reading a lecture to the western members, saying how grateful they should be that, in these appropriations, out of a total of some $27,000,000 the West is receiving the sum of $21,000,000 for railway extension in their district. In my opinion it is not a matter of gratitude, but a matter of straight business. We in the West are grateful that we have at the present time at the head of our National Railways a gentleman who thoroughly understands conditions, and he is making the proposal to build lines in western Canada because it is a straight business proposition. He is looking to western Canada and the products of that country to pay the deficits upon the National Railways that probably were incurred in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec—

Mr. HOCKEN: Not Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES:—and the Maritime provinces. I would ask the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), when he goes home at the end of the week, and probably makes a political speech, to quote these figures to his constituents. During the last ten years, from 1913 to the year 1920-23, the Public Works department, or the government. have spent in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario the sum of $98,916,428 on public buildings, dredging, docks and so forth. In the three western provinces during that period they spent a total sum of $10,465,000. When I go to the west I am going to tell them that we are rather grateful to Sir Henry Thornton for the proposal to spend these large sums of money on the western Canadian roads. I am also going to quote these figures of expenditures made in the East. No good purpose is ever served in this House, or on the hustings or anywhere else, by making such speeches as were made by my hon. friend from West Toronto in this House this afternoon.

Mr. RINFRET: I think some consideration should be given to the stand we are taking on this matter. This is a demand on parliament for the construction of branch railways to the extent of 1,000 miles, representing an expenditure about $25,000,000. Before the day is over I suppose there will be a demand from members of the House for an additional 1,000 miles of branch lines and an additional expenditure of $25,000,000. I may be permitted very frankly to state the awkward position in which some of us are placed concerning the management of the railways. This is another instance where we have a clash between control and responsibility. Speaking in Montreal some time ago before the Cartier Club, the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) stated that we on this side had abandoned our policy in railway matters to rally to his viewpoint, and that you could not point to a Liberal who would dare advocate private ownership. But on the estimates of the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) the leader of the Opposition took the opposite stand, and after vigorously setting forth his policy, stated that we were merely carrying out the scheme laid down by Mr. Ballantyne; and I suppose, after we have allowed this resolution to pass and approved of it, he will say that we lack consistency, and that events are bearing testimony to the excellency of his own policy as against ours. The hon. member for West Toronto only a minute ago took the occasion of this resolution to raise once more the question of public and private ownership coming into conflict.

Now, we have to deal with facts. The question now is not whether or not we should enter into a scheme of government ownership, but it is how best we can deal with the situation as it is and as we found it when we came into power in 1921. The choice is not to be made, it was made by hon. members opposite when they were in power, and it was the late government which loaded on this government the system that we have now to deal with. In opposition we said, and still say, at least I still say, that it was a mistake to acquire these roads on the conditions on which they were purchased, by accepting at par all the obligations and debts which these railways carried at the time. We said in opposition, and we also believe now, that it was a mistake for the late government to complete the ship programme of the late government, when it became evident that these ships might as well be burned or sunk, because they would be useless. But, as a matter of fact, we have the railways and we have the ships. The fact that we have resolved to submit them to a fair trial is no indication at all that we accept the principle against which we voted, or that we withdraw anything of the criticisms which we offered when these matters were first before parliament. It ill behooves the leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) to sneer at the government now or at some of the Liberal members, when he more than any other is responsible for the present situation. We are now asked to add a number of miles of railway to this system.

Mr. HOCKEN: What alternative had the country at the time the railways were taken over?

Mr. RINFRET: My point is: What alternative have we to-day?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am asking what alternative there was when the railways were taken over.

Mr. RINFRET: I am not discussing that It was ruled that it was out of order.

An hon. MEMBER: Side-stepping.

Mr. RINFRET: I say that after we have decided to submit these railways to a fair trial, it is unfair for the leader of the Opposition to claim that we have abandoned our principle of private ownership. I will not discuss what alternative there was some years ago, because that is not the question here; I say that we have no alternative now I will go further, I have no hesitation in saying that if we had an alternative, I for one would favour at once the disposal of these railways to private ownership.

An hon. MEMBER: At what price?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: One dollar.

Mr. RINFRET: I do not think anybody would buy the roads if they had to take the fixed charges with them.

As for the resolution, I may say that at first sight I am very reluctant to add one inch to a system that is already so extensive; but it is a well-known fact in railway matters that often a connecting line at a small cost may work a great deal towards the general revenue of the main line. I am conversant with the facts concerning the proposed line in the province of Quebec. I may say that I have some sympathy with the opinion expressed this afternoon that the proportion we are going to get is very small. This is a very small line, intended, I understand, to connect the trunk line to Ottawa with another railway which goes to the Laurentide mountains. There is a great traffic of passengers in that direction, especially during the summer. They generally have to use the Canadian Pacific from St. Jérôme to Montfort junction, and then take the Canadian National line. The construction of this branch line is well warranted, and I am quite willing to hear what can be said in support of the other lines that are proposed. But again I say: The question is not, to my mind, as to the advisability of constructing these lines, the question is this: Are we going to decide on this point, or should we not rather trust the administration who have been placed in control of the railways? If there is to be a fair trial of our present system, that means that we should be very careful not to interfere in any way with the proper carrying out of that trial. Last year the leader of the Opposition bluntly stated that there could be no fair trial of these railways, because we had in the government members who were opposed to the very scheme. This year he repeated the same thing when he discussed the Merchant Marine, and he said that he did not believe in the management of an enterprise by people who were unsympathetic to it. I suppose my right hon. friend himself does not follow that line of conduct. My right hon. friend the other day made a violent speech against the buying in Paris of real estate by the Board of Management of the Canadian National Railways. If I were to-day to object strenuously to these branches being built, or if some criticism were offered from this side of

the House, it would be contended that we were not sympathetic to a fair trial, or that we were carrying on a propaganda on behalf of a private company. On the other hand, if we do not do that, and if we refrain from offering any remarks, we are treated as abandoning our policy and lacking consistency. Some people achieve greatness, but this is a case in which greatness is thrust upon us. A fair trial does not mean final endorsation. Our party has not taken the initiative in government ownership in this country, and it would be a great mistake thus to misinterpret our sincere efforts to draw the country out of the difficulties it was placed in when we inherited power in 1921. But if we are going to have a fair trial, we must provide the means, and we must rest some confidence in the men in charge of the railway. I do not say that it should go unlimited, either as to the amount involved, or as to the duration; but I am willing to admit that this resolution remains within the bounds of such a trial. I do not need to stress the fact, though, that any addition to the fixed charges of the roads should be made only with the utmost care and reserve. It must have struck everyone in this House when the Minister of Finance (Mr Fielding) brought down his budget that, in 1921 and again in 1922, we had a surplus in our finances over all expenditures, current and capital, and that we were prevented from balancing the sheet only because we had in the one year to provide $98,000,000 for the railways, and in another year to provide $95,000,000 for the railways. We may say to-day that the railways alone are responsible for our adding annually to the national debt. I hope these facts were not lost sight of by the commissioners when the demand for these lines was made to the government. I hope they are of that character that they will by themselves more than repay their cost to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid that the discussion has, perhaps, gone beyond these resolutions. I do not, however, object to anything that has been said, because I feel that the committee and members of parliament have a duty to perform. I think we could expedite the business of parliament if we could let these resolutions go through and get into the hands of every member the bill based on them with all the details. Then they would be prepared to discuss it, taking as much time as they like. I am not going to discuss government ownership, because we have it. We want to do the best possible in the circumstances, and the sentiment of the House seems to be in that direction.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has stated the case of the railway in which he is interested, and all he has said is true. Some years ago, the second portion of this railway was built, heavy subsidies, excess subsidies being paid on account of the many bridges, and the construction was very expensive. But of late, at least, the operation of that line has been anything but satisfactory. Sir Henry Thornton, I think, had a conference with the president of that road, and he expressed a willingness, on terms, to take over the operation, but up to the present time no arrangement has been arrived at. I agree that there ought to be some way, particularly as regards a line that was largely built by the government, by which the people in the district who depend upon that line might get some service.

The thing that appealed to me in the remarks of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), was the invitation to come down. I understand the situation in which the lines that he spoke of are placed. I assure him that I will bring his remarks to the attention of Sir Henry Thornton and the board. I might point out that in these resolutions there is not a single line that has not been recommended by the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Do all the lines included in these resolutions connect with government-owned railway lines?

Mr. GRAHAM: These lines are divided into two classes. Those of one class are called government railways, including the old government line. These are dealt with separately in these resolutions. Then these other lines that are proposed will become branches of the Canadian National system. As to the county of Kent, New Brunswick, the Kent Northern railway is twenty-seven miles long, and I quite appreciate the fact that it might just as well have been twenty-seven inches long so far as its operation has been of any practical value. The question has been discussed as to how these people can best be served in that section of the country, because they are not served now. An effort was made by the previous government to take over the Kent Northern, and large petitions have come in from the county of Kent asking that the Moncton-Buctouche line be extended 18 miles to serve a greater number of people outside of the town of Richibucto, or Rexton, I believe, through which it passes. These matters are under consideration, and I have asked the management of the Canadian National Railways, as soon as they can possibly

do so, to make a thorough investigation of the situation in the county of Kent, because my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Leger) has made my life miserable for the past three months over the question and will continue to do so, I am afraid, if I do not do something. However, I am awaiting reports from the Canadian National board. Under the Branch Lines Act lines connecting with the government railways can be dealt with, but any bargains made must be approved by parliament.

The question of the Inverness railway has also come before the Canadian National board, and so far as I can ascertain from previous reports, the people of that section are not being served by that railway. It was owned by a coal company; and while I must not say harsh things, it has been represented to me, nevertheless, with some fair show of credibility, as I think, that, like some of the big railways in the United States, this company has squeezed out any other that tried to do business because it gave all its traffic to the railway it owned itself. This is the situation in regard to the Inverness railway and it is possible that something practical may be done in the matter before another session of parliament.

With regard to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), I like that hon. gentleman because he keeps good-natured every day, except on the Twelfth of July, and he is always a strong advocate of public ownership; in fact he could not get elected in the city of Toronto if he were not. But he made this mistake, though not intentionally, that the programme will only extend over three years, the amount of money he suggested for the whole project being some $27,000,000 or $28,000,000. So that for the present year the appropriation would be one-third of that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): There are some lines that ought to be completed, such as, for instance, the Long Lac line.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is under construction now. As to the Hudson Bay railway, nothing has been voted yet, so that the hon. gentleman was in error in that regard. There was a small vote, but it was for the purpose of protecting works that we have there now. I might intimate to the committee, however, that believing that the promises of the government and of parliament should be carried out, I shall consider putting a certain amount in the Supplementary Estimates in this connection. Now, my hon. friend from East York—is it? or South York? I do not know which, for they have changed the designation of the constituencies since I used to campaign against him (Mr. Maclean)—suggests amalgamating these lines at once. Towns and villages have sprung up outside Toronto, and they need railway accommodation. You cannot very easily or quickly make any change in that respect, however. The question of grading has something to do with it. The old Grand Trunk tried to get a better grade from Scarborough Heights into Toronto, but they discovered that to go by the lake front would raise a riot, and my hon. friend's paper kicked up a fuss about it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What was needed was a real scheme.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was another scheme my hon. friend suggested, but it would cost a great deal of money. However, these things will no doubt be accomplished in time. At present the board is endeavouring to uniform the whole system as expeditiously as possible, and so far as this is concerned there is no difference in opinion as regards east or west, north or south. What I have submitted is the Canadian National board's programme, as handed to me, and which I think is a good thing for the railways and for the country generally. One of the reasons for this three-year programme being placed on the statutes is that the people may understand exactly what they are going to get for some time. It has been stated, and quite properly so, that the psychology of those who advocate a thing has a great deal to do with influencing its promotion. Many of these branch lines in the West are not new structures; very many miles of these lines have been graded, some of the grades having been constructed since the war, although the rails have not been laid down. There are some four hundred miles of grading already done, and all we propose to do is to lay the rails. Surely, no one would suggest that it is bad business, if after investigation the previous board decided to build these lines, for the present board to complete the work. It will be a good investment for the company and for the country as well. If the committee will agree to my suggestion and let us get this matter embodied in a bill I think it will expedite our business. Every member will have the bill before him and we shall bring it up on Monday in order to discuss the details.

Mr. GOULD: I will comply with the request of the minister and defer my remarks until the bill is distributed.

Mr. LUCAS: In view of the minister's request, I do not want to enter into any discussion of this matter now, but I want to know whether he can give us any information

as to why a certain branch line in the province of Alberta has been eliminated from this schedule. The line to which I refer is known as the Bruederheim railway. In the month of March the Alberta members, realizing that Sir Henry Thornton is a very busy man, got together and decided that one meeting with him should be made to cover all the various points which they desired to submit to him. We all had railway troubles in our constituencies, and we laid our grievances before Sir Henry Thornton, who presented to us a schedule which I understood at the time—as I think other hon. members from Alberta will bear me out—was practically along the same line as that which we have before us to-day. In that schedule was this proposed railway commencing at the town of Bruederheim and extending easterly for a distance of 31 miles. The people have been asking for this railway for a number of years, and they had the assurance of Sir Henry Thornton that it would be undertaken; at least it was in the schedule, which was submitted to the delegation and all it required was the attention of parliament. But before going any further, some few weeks later, he being out of town, I telephoned to the deputy minister. He was not in at the time, so I asked the gentleman who answered the telephone to ascertain if it was correct that the schedule which had been presented to me by Sir Henry Thornton was O.K.. A couple of hours later he telephoned me that my information was correct. Naturally, I am very much disappointed to find that this line is omitted from the schedule to the resolution. If this is an oversight, I hope that before the minister brings down the bill he will make good the omission.

Mr. SPENCER: I wish to confirm the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Lucas). The line he mentions is very, very badly needed. I understand it was promised about twenty years ago to the people in the country through which it will run. In my own constituency men are hauling their grain to the railroad for distances up to thirty miles, and this, as is well known, is such a severe handicap that they cannot possibly carry on their farming at a profit. On account of the continued failure to build this line many people have left the district, and the only way in which we can induce those who are still there to remain, and can also encourage new settlers, is to construct this railway without further delay. I sincerely hope therefore that there is an oversight in not including this line in the schedule of proposed branch line construction; and, if so, that it will be included at an early date.

5 p.m.

Mr. FORTIER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure to rise and express my appreciation for the happy thought the government has had in extending into the county of Labelle, one of the main branches of the National Railways. Indeed, in this proposed measure before the House we note that fourteen miles have been added to the National Railways in the province of Quebec. These fourteen miles, I am happy to say, lend themselves for the most part to the development of this important branch which projects from the main line, near Montreal, and penetrating into the region of the Laurentides extends to the county of Labelle.

I therefore wish to express my thanks and those of my electors to the government for having realized this important work of extending this railway. In fact, twelve of the fourteen miles will be built for the purpose of connecting the main line from Montreal to Ottawa at a place known as Frenierè with another point called Rinfret Junction which is the beginning point of the railway known as Montfort, and which has existed for a great number of years in that region. These twelve miles of rail will therefore be built in such a way as to link up the Montfort railway with the National main line from Montreal to Ottawa. This connection is very important; it is absolutely necessary and will contribute in making of this branch line one of the important lines of the province of Quebec. I especially wish to thank the government for having completed the branch line of the Montfort railway which was later on acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway and finally was included in our national system of railways. This completed work comprises the construction of about two miles of railway, from a point called China Clay extending to the village of St. Rémi d'Amherst which is situated close to the centre of the county of Labelle. These two miles of rail were only laid down so as to complete the main branch line. In fact, for a great number of years, the railway existed up to the village of Huberdeau, situated on the borders of the county of Argenteuil. Later, so as to help the mining industry, the rails were extended about nine miles into the county of Labelle, on the borders of the townships of Ponsonby and Amherst; however, this extension covering nine miles was simply built for the transportation of freight and the products of the mine. Heretofore passenger trains had not been in circulation as far as that point. For ever so long the people of Labelle have

petitioned the government. I had the pleasure to accompany their delegations to request the late government to finish this work by building these few miles which were absolutely necessary to connect this railway with those southern settled districts of the county of Labelle. As a result of these steps, I am glad to see that the Liberal government has generously acceded to the request of the electors of my county and that in the proposed measure there is an item of $65,000 for the construction of these two miles of railway which will extend the National Railway up to the village of Saint Rémi d'Amherst and which, later on I hope, will be followed by a further extension, as conditions render this work indispensable and which, I again state, will make of this line one of the most important branches of the National Railways in the province of Quebec. By thus establishing, through this branch line, its terminus at St. Rémi d'Amherst, the National Railway Company comes to the rescue of the parishes which are settled in that region for a great number of years. The government desires to help colonization, this so important work, a truly national effort, that we propose to develop in the province and especially in the district of Labelle. The government assures itself, by linking these parishes, of an increase in traffic which will, I am sure, make of this line one of the most paying propositions of the National Railways.

The question of the National Railways is certainly one of the most important problems of the day. Since the beginning of this debate the subject has been dealt with most ably by the members who have preceded me. It is absolutely important, in a young country like ours, to further the work in connection with our railways. It is in settlements like those we have in the province of Quebec that we note the immense progress accomplished thanks to railway construction. I have but to point out, as an example, the north west of Montreal the beautiful region of Labelle, which was opened up by the Canadian Pacific Railway. This region like the one still older found in Gaspé, has now its diocese, it is inhabited by numerous and intelligent settlers who have made the heart of the Laurentian hills like a new province. It is due to the development of railways that this region has been settled —the work shall be carried on, I know, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, for I have their promise, as far as the distant valley of the Lièvre, to the north of Mont Laurier, in the parishes of Ferme-Neuve and Sainte-Anne du Lac—and we will witness great strides in colonization in that part of the province which is so dear to us. The same thing is being enacted in the centre of the county of Labelle, and it is thanks to the work done by the government through the extension of this line of the Canadian National Railway, as far as Saint-Rémi d'Amherst that the settlers may rejoice in having new means to develop that part of the country. Numerous and rich mining industries are already established at Saint-Rém. d'Amherst, the farming industry has been progressing in that place for many years and this parish is surrounded by other flourishing parishes situated in the heart of Labelle county, which, at present, is at a distance of 20 to 40 miles from the northern system of the Canadian Pacific railway, and which now is directly connected, through this branch line of the Canadian National Railway, with the metropolis of Canada.

By opening up the colonization region of the county of Labelle the government insures the progress of the National Railways, because as it was pointed out with a great deal of truth, probably the chief cause of the deficits of our railways rests in the fact that we own, up to the present, great transcontinentals. only, which however, were necessary at the time of their construction. These branch lines which will extend to the northern parts of our province, to the extreme limits of settlements, and will afford us the advantage of opening up new districts to settlers, will also afford us the means of considerably increasing the traffic of our railways, owing to our rich natural resources which are unlimited in the northern parts of our province. Thereby, I say, will the government ensure the successful operation of our National Railways. We congratulate them and I heartily thank them both in my name and that of the electors of the county of Labelle, for the happy thought they had in developing the National railway and extending it as far as Saint-Rémi d'Amherst.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I would ask the minister if provision will be made this session for a railway survey between Grande Prairie and the Canadian National Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has heard me being chastised a few moments ago for disclosing arrangements prematurely. I shall have to follow the lines of the Minister of Finance and say, "Wait and see."

In regard to the other matter, I might say that perhaps a hundred lines are being pressed on the board, and as my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) said in reference to the amendment to the act providing for the

indemnities, I told them to take it back and clarify it. We can only spend so much money, and the clarified list is the one I have here now. It will take some years to get around to the point where we would have been had there been no war, but if members will be patient, as fast as the Canadian National Railway board can see its way clear after investigation to recommend further construction, the government, so far as the finances of the country will warrant, will meet the situation. The Canadian National Railway board had a much larger list for consideration, but on account of the financial situation they were asked to "clarify" it, and this is the "clarified" list.

Mr. McCONICA: There is one point that I think has not been brought to the attention of the House as to these western lines. I think I am correct when I say that there is not a single new line under contemplation here. They all represent, as I understand it, the continuation of work that was started before the war; they are rounding out the system—connecting up all the loose ends, as it were. Now these loose ends having been laid out, located, and in some cases work commenced upon them, the territory along these lines has been filled up with settlers. They have been waiting there for years, and the completion of these lines will mean an immediate increase in the tonnage of the various roads. This is not new construction. It is not like starting out to build a new line somewhere, but is simply carrying out the plans that were agreed upon and the finishing of work that was interrupted by the war. I would ask the minister if I am not correct in that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my hon. friend is in the main correct. His remarks might not apply to every case, but practically they cover the case.

Mr. LEWIS: I would ask the minister when the bill comes up on Monday, if that is the day set, to bring down as much definite information as possible in regard to No. 19, the Dunblane branch to Mawer, Saskatchewan, about which I spoke to him last night. I have received further telegrams to-day asking that from the standpoint of economy the existing line up to the river be utilized as far as possible. It was pointed out to me to-day that if the line was to be built as proposed it would open up no new territory and bring no more traffic to the Canadian National line, but would involve the construction of about thirty miles of new road. We have a road already existing in that territory, and if the minister could see fit to utilize this existing line as far as the river it would give a more direct connection and be more economical. An expensive dam was built on the river about a year and a half ago; it is a divisional point and within eight miles of the Beachy line, and I can see no reason why the connection across the river should not be made as direct as possible, unless it is that there are insurmountable difficulties in the way of bridging the river at Riverhurst. I would ask the minister to bring down all the information when this matter next comes up.

Mr. GRAHAM: I expect that when the bill comes up next I shall have to have here with me one or two railway men from the head office in Montreal.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Before paragraph 1 of the resolution, which I believe embodies the schedule, carries, I would point out to the minister the need for a correction in the spelling of one word in Item No. 15 of the schedule. It says the "Eaton Branch." There was some years ago a town a few stations west of Eston called Eaton, and there was such a mix-up in mails that it became necessary to change the name of Eaton to Eatonia. The word here should be Eston, not Eaton, and I would suggest that the correction be made in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the word "Eston" be substituted for the word "Eaton"?

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Graham thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 234, respecting the construction of the Canadian National lines.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

On motion of Sir Lomer Gouin amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 139 to amend the Bankruptcy Act were read the second time and concurred in.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

On motion of Hon. Charles Stewart (Minister of the Interior) for the House to again go into committee on Bill No. 222, to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. STEVENS: This is a bill that the right hon. leader of the Opposition is particularly interested in, and if the minister is

agreeable, I would prefer to have it stand There are other bills that can be gone on with unless some particular reason exists for proceeding with the present measure.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know there is one clause the leader of the Opposition is interested in.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps the minister would like to proceed with the bill, with the consent of the House, and hold that particular clause in committee.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think we had better proceed. We can leave the bill in committee and allow the clause to stand that the leader of the Opposition is interested in.

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

On section 2—Transfer of holders of letters patent in pre-emption and purchased homestead area to another homestead, by provincial certificate.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is the clause the leader of the Opposition is particularly interested in. We could let it stand.

Section stands.

On section 3—Issue of patent after death of applicant.

Mr. STEVENS: I think it would be better if the minister, as we take up each clause, were to give reasons for the amendments and changes proposed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Section 3 provides that when a homesteader dies before completing the duties necessary to earn patent, his legal representatives are excused from doing any further residence duty. The act as it stands calls for the erection of a house and the completion of cultivation, but as no further residence is required it is considered unnecessary to insist on the erection of the house, it being frequently the case that a house so erected will deteriorate in value before the estate could secure the opportunity of disposing of the land. In cases of decease this dispenses with the necessity of constructing a habitable house to earn patent.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Issue of patent if applicant becomes insane.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The same thing applies where the applicant becomes insane.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. McTAGGART: Would the provisions of this section apply in cases of pre-emption as well?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, there is a little different provision in the case of pre-emption. This applies only to a homestead.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Sections 11 and 29 in each township, together with gold and silver and other minerals, set apart as school lands.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This section is to make it clear that the minerals belong to the provinces. There was necessity for clarity here. The lands themselves are the property of the province, and all receipts from the lands are treated as trust funds, at least for educational purposes. We are now putting minerals in the same category.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Is it not a fact that some lands other than sections 11 and 29 are considered as school lands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That has happened in some cases of transfer, and in other cases.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Would they be covered by this?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, all lands that are designated school lands would be covered.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Terms of payment for school lands.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In connection with this clause, I notice that the provision for selling applies after the first day of January, 1923, the purchase price being divided into twenty equal amounts. I was wondering if the department is going to do anything to relieve the settlers who have purchased school lands under the old agreement. There are a great many settlers with whom I am acquainted who have purchased school lands on the old conditions providing for payment in ten years and have made payment of one-tenth of the purchase price. Some of them have improved that land, brought it all under cultivation, built houses and barns, and put down wells. A purchaser has such a place as this home but he has been unable to make, possibly, any further payment or, if any, only a very small one, and the interest has been accumulating. Now, I have had correspondence from several to the effect that they are unable to pay the principal and unable to meet even the interest, and in different cases they have

requested that some concessions be made to them to enable them to carry on. I believe, generally speaking, they are quite willing to pay the original purchase price, but in some cases they ask that the interest be deleted from the agreement. In view of the fact that a special concession is to be made for all new purchasers would it not be consistent that some concession should also be made for the old purchasers who have been struggling along for several years, who are good settlers, and who are anxious and willing to make good if given a chance. Has the minister any plan in view that is likely to be adopted for relief in such cases?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might point out to the hon. member that, in the position we occupy, our trusteeship is of rather a limited character. The provinces are consulted as to the areas that shall be sold and as to the terms upon which the lands shall be sold. They were consulted in this instance as to an extension of the periods over which payment of principal might be made. This matter came up in the discussion. The amendment as outlined by my hon. friend makes the period for the payment of principal twenty years instead of ten years, as under the old provision. The provinces agreed to this. Indeed, it is at their request, because they think the land will bring a greater price than it would under the old provision. The question of making it retroactive is a little difficult; but as we are acting as a trustee we can be lenient in the collection of the principal. I think many of the contracts that are outstanding to-day will run twenty years. We have not pressed for payment of principal. Very frequently there are large delayed payments of interest; but if the cultivation is going on we do not press for payment. So that, without touching the contract in existence, the party who has the land under contract may run for fifteen or twenty years before he has finally paid up his principal.

Mr. BROWN: In regard to the interest charged on the amounts overdue, a few years ago a regulation was issued charging 7 per cent on agreements entered into at 5 per cent on payments that were overdue. Is that still the policy of the department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, that still stands. That also was an arrangement with the provinces.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am not fully satisfied with the explanation, because this morning I received a letter from one of my constituents who was on the land referred to, and he enclosed a letter which he received from the department, which pointed out very clearly and explicitly that he was in arrears several years on his contract for principal and interest, and that unless he showed very good and sufficient reason in the near future why he should be carried any longer, without paying up some of the arrears, the contract would be immediately cancelled. That is the kind of thing the settler is up against. He is in constant fear of having his contract cancelled, unless he appeals to the department for special extensions of one year at a time. In view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as I believe, has written up all its own contracts for a long period of time, to give settlers a chance, I would think it almost incumbent on the department to do likewise. Will the minister state if it is within the jurisdiction of the department to do this, without first getting the consent of the provincial government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think we could do it without consent, but I do not think it would be wise for us to do it without consultation and consent. So far it has not been done. We have kept the provinces fully informed of any suggested changes, and usually the changes have been suggested by the provinces themselves. The difficulty in the case the hon. member mentions is not particularly the arrears of principal, but the failure to pay interest. We do not wish to be hard on any one but as trustee for the province, without being unduly harsh and without creating hardship, we will have to try to collect the interest. That is one of the very serious complaints. I could produce innumerable letters, particularly from the departments of education of the prairie provinces, complaining bitterly that we are neglecting the collection of the interest payments due on these school lands sales. In the case of Alberta, I think the ordinary amounts of interest payments received this year by the province have fallen off over $100,000, and the province is largely, though not altogether, dependent upon that fund for carrying on its schools. It is of very real assistance to it in carying on its school work, and the pressure comes from the province to collect the interest. The provinces are not vitally interested in the collection of principal, because if they are receiving the interest the principal is a trust fund for that purpose anyway. They do insist on our trying to collect the interest, and while we are not desirous of creating hardship yet we look upon it as a duty to try to collect, as far as possible, the interest which has accrued on these sales.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has the question of making the amendment retroactive been discussed with the provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, I thought I mentioned that. It was discussed at the time we discussed the extensions, but it was felt, inasmuch as we did not press for principal payments that no great harm was being done. It would not make any change in the situation. It might, to some extent of course, relieve, if that were possible the payment of the 7 per cent, or the 1 per cent additional, on money that was overdue; but that would be a somewhat involved process, because of the difficulty that probably six per cent of the people under contract have paid. Clearly the only relief that could be given would be to those who did not pay; and it would be discrimination against those who did pay, so that it presents a somewhat difficult problem.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: In that point of view, I would like to support the contention of the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael), not in regard to the department making no effort to recover the interest—I quite see the position in that respect—but in reference to making the amendment dealing with the payment of interest retroactive; because, while I recognize that the department has in very few cases pressed for the payment of the principal, at the same time I think it would tend to reassure the purchasers that the principal payments which they were expected to make from year to year would be reduced by that amount. I believe the precedent set by the Canadian Pacific Railway is a sound one in that respect. I believe the precedent set in our amendment to the Soldiers' Settlement Act was in the same direction; that is to re-assure these people that year by year the payments would not be greater than they could reasonably be expected to meet. Although pressure is not being exerted, I do think the moral assurance to the men in knowing that they could take advantage of this provision, and that they would not be expected to pay the principal, would have a beneficial effect. A good many cases have been brought to my notice, and I mentioned to the people concerned that I thought an amendment to this effect would be brought down in the bill which would be introduced, and that there would probably be an extension of time for payment of principal. I hope the minister will see his way to make the bill retroactive in that respect, thus affording the men who have already purchased and are in difficulty the same opportunity of extending the payments as will be afforded under the new act.

Mr. McTAGGART: Would the minister state what is the practice of the department in reference to the school lands which were sold and afterwards abandoned? Some of them were broken up and a good many were abandoned.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as possible we tried to lease them. There was a suggstion—if not a suggestion, a complaint—I think from the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) with respect to the number of sales that have taken place in recent years where prices were very high, running well over $50 per acre for raw land. Those people who have contracted to pay that price, find themselves in serious difficulties. He was asking if some relief could not be afforded in those cases. That is a very difficult matter, and I do not know how to get around it unless we do this: Where an individual, under a contract of sale, finds himself in difficulties, we lease to him, indeed we are glad to lease to him if he surrenders his contract, and then on the next occasion when the sale comes around, if the lands do not sell for the prices they did formerly, he can become a purchaser under the new contract. In the meantime he can be a tenant until such time as it is deemed advisable to re-sell the land. But of course we try in every case, if possible, to lease the land and to keep it from getting dirty and weedy.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): When the sale of these lands is completed and the money as I understand, is turned in to the Dominion government, do you still continue to pay a rate of interest to the schools on that money for the benefit of the provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are simply trustees in the matter. We turn over such money as we collect, less cost of collection only, to the provinces, for them to distribute to the school districts of the provinces. They, in turn, distribute it.

Mr MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Is the money derived from the sale not turned in to the Dominion government?

Mr. STEWART. (Argenteuil): Yes, we are trustees, the money comes to the Dominion government.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): The government does not keep it indefinitely without interest?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. We simply turn over such interest as we collect. The trust fund itself is an interest bearing fund, of course, and the interest is turned over to the provinces as well. The trust fund is in the hands of the Dominion government.

Mr. GOULD: I have in mind a certain district in my part of the country where a sale of school lands took place some years ago, and the residents, because of that, formed themselves into a school district. Some of the lands were abandoned later on, and I believe the secretary-treasurers of the districts have endeavoured to collect taxes on these lands from the Dominion government. When I took the question up with the department, the advice which I received was that they did not feel bound to pay the taxes to the school districts. I merely call to the minister's attention the circumstance that the school districts thus formed are in a very precarious position because of those abandoned lands, and because the government does not assume the responsibility of paying school taxes. I have particularly in mind an area in the Moose mountain country, districts that were opened up in 1916, the lands being sold in 1917.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Would the minister take the question of making this amendment retroactive very seriously into his consideration during the recess, take it up with the provinces further and, if they are agreeable, bring down an amendment to the legislation? Because I believe this would be a great benefit, would lift a certain load, and would give an amount of moral reassurance to the men who purchased under the act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Inasmuch as we hope to get through shortly, I was going to suggest that I would be very glad to take this matter up with the provinces during the recess. There will be no pressure during the year, and if the provinces are agreeable, the matter is immaterial to the department.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That was my idea.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It was felt that really no hardship would result unless the Dominion government pressed for payment of principal on those lands. If we pressed for payment of principal money, of course there would be a very serious hardship; but so long as the provinces were content to allow extensions to be granted, provided, of course, that the interest or reasonable amounts of interest were being paid, then the individual holding the contract would suffer no great hardship. That was the feeling, I may say, when we discussed the matter before. But I will undertake to take it up again with the provincial representatives and to present the views of members of the committee on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am very glad, because I feel that although no actual hardship may be suffered, except by reason of the accrued interest, still there is a certain amount of hardship in feeling that heavy payments are impending, when they know that they will not be able to meet them; that they must apply for an extension year after year with the certainty that they will not be able to pay the principal.

Mr. GOULD: The minister has not replied in regard to the point that I brought up.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is back to the vexed question of Crown lands paying taxes. So far as possible, we insist on the tenant, where land is leased, paying the ordinary taxes of the municipality; but where land is unoccupied, held by the Crown, I could not enlarge on what I have already said in respect to the matter.

Mr. GOULD: I do not think I have had any requests from a municipal point of view. The requests have been merely from the school districts themselves. These lands are unoccupied. There was another question which I have mentioned a couple of times, I believe, during the session. It is prompted also by correspondence which I have received from people who, in former years, have bought school lands, that is, who have made a contract with the Dominion government to pay principal and interest based on a rate of interest of 5 per cent. I myself was one of the guilty parties in the year 1916. The minister knows, and the committee is well aware of the fact that we have visitations of hail, grasshoppers, drouth and various other things, which oblige people to defer interest or principal payments. I believe an order in council was passed by the former minister, which penalized the people by raising the rate of interest to 7 per cent. That was quite a hardship on people residing in the West, and I have received several protests from people who were under that disability. They have asked me to present their case in order to see if some concession could not be made, if the interest rate could not remain as it was before to all bona fide purchasers who are keeping up their payments, so that no penalty, by way of an increase of 2 per cent in the rate of interest, might be imposed upon them by reason of a visitation of Providence.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This matter was discussed at a provincial conference. I believe I must pead guilty to being the Al-

berta representative. Mr. Martin represented Saskatchewan, and, I believe, Mr. Norris represented Manitoba. Inasmuch as the interest received from the sale of school lands played such an important part in the revenues for the running of our public schools, we were anxious that large amounts outstanding should be collected. It was suggested at that conference that this was one way to hasten that collection, and we all agreed to it. I must take my share of the responsibility. The object that we had in view was to get in those large outstanding amounts of interest that had accrued against those lands and to utilize them, of course, for the carrying on of our educational work in the provinces. Therefore, in fairness to the federal government, I think they should be given only their share of the responsibility. That was our hope. Unfortunately, in subsequent years, we have had drouth in most of the western provinces, and this is somewhat of a hardship on people owning school lands. I think, however, my hon. friend will agree with me that we did this with the best intention in the world, in the hope that we would assist struggling school districts who needed so badly the distribution of the school funds in all the provinces.

Section agreed to.

On section 7, paragraph (b)—Limits of areas of timber limits.

Mr. STEVENS: There is possibly an error in paragraph (b), or, perhaps, I do not read it correctly. The paragraph reads:

Permits to cut timber as cordwood, pulpwood, fence posts or telegraph poles for mining purposes.

Should not that be "telegraph poles or props for mining purposes?" There are no telegraph poles for mining purposes?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had not noticed that before; the hon. member is right.

Mr. STEVENS: While the minister is making the correction I would ask him this question. Does this amendment relate to the order in council which was passed early in the year? I cannot recall the exact terms of it, but I read it some months ago and I remember that it provides for certain things with reference to pulpwood areas in Manitoba.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, this is a different matter. Our difficulty, I may explain, lies in the areas where we want to give permits to individuals to take out pulpwood, cordwood and so forth. Take British Columbia, for instance. In a large part of that province these areas are under the forestry regulations and can be let under lease only so that the small man has no opportunity to get in at all. We cannot at present give him any permit to cut his fence posts or take out cord wood, and this gives the small man the opportunity he has not heretofore enjoyed.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it not a pretty wide and general power that is taken here? It is all to be done by the Governor in Council, apparently without any restrictions.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are subject to restrictions, with the exception that in the burnt areas the dues are one-half those that obtain in the green timber areas; and when the cut wood is measured the full dues are charged on all that is not burnt.

Mr STEVENS: That is provided for elsewhere, I suppose.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I move to amend paragraph (b) by inserting after the word "poles" in line 38 the words "or props for mining purposes."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9—Governor in Council may authorize inquiry before or after issue of patent.

Mr. STEVENS: This appears to be a rather important section; it empowers imprisonment in a common gaol. Is this a new provision or is it an adjustment of one that already exists?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The department are not very clear as to whether they have statutory authority. But if fraud is committed in the securing of a patent and it is afterwards discovered they can take action.

Mr. STEVENS: Is that action taken through ordinary procedure in the courts or at the instance of the departmental officials?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Through the officials of the department. Under paragraph (g) of section 76 the Governor in Council has authority to institute an inquiry in respect of Dominion lands.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—No employee to purchase or acquire interest in Dominion lands.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This merely extends to the officials of all departments the prohibition which hitherto applied only to the Department of the Interior. There has been a provision that no official of the Department of the Interior could be interested in

the lands in question or have any mining rights therein. That provision now extends to all departments.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR

The House again in committee on Bill No. 217, respecting the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 10—Expropriation of lands.

Mr. BUREAU: This is a copy of section 25 of the act in reference to Vancouver harbour.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—By-laws.

Mr. LAPOINTE: These are the usual clauses.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—Borrowing powers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I move that this section be amended by adding after the word "of" in line 22 the word "constructing" so that it will now read—

—and for the further purpose of constructing, repairing and improving.

I also want to amend the section by striking out the word "the" before "wharves."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the third reading of Bill No. 218, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

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

FISHERIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 223, to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914.

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

On section 1—License fee:

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister give a brief explanation of this?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The annual fee for a salmon canner's license was $500. In addition to that the canner has to pay a fee of 4 cents on each case of forty-eight 1-pound cans of sockeye salmon and 3 cents on each case of forty-eight 1-pound cans of any other species of salmon. The object of the bill is to reduce the license fee from $500 to $20. It has been the intention of the department to do that for some time, and it was recommended unanimously by the Fisherise Commission.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise) moved the second reading of Bill No. 225, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

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

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has this bill been printed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but copies are not on the table. We have sent for copies and they will be distributed in a moment.

Mr. BUREAU: The bill has been printed a long while.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps while we are waiting for copies of the bill the minister will give us an explanation.

Mr. BUREAU: The old clauses are being repealed, and the amendments are shown in italics. One of the amendments is to extend the interpretation of the word "analyst." Heretofore the meaning of the word has been confined to the analyst in the department.

Mr. STEVENS: I think my hon. friend did explain this the other day.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, I explained the whole thing. This is to give a wider meaning to the word analyst so that the juniors who really make the analysis may be heard in court. The other amendment is to provide a penalty for those who deodorize denatured alcohol. Heretofore a penalty could only be imposed in the case of methylated alcohol.

On section 2—Departmental analyst.

Mr. STEVENS: I remember the minister explaining this bill yesterday. I understood

him to say this provision was made necessary owing to some difficulty that had been experienced in proving the case in prosecutions, or something to that effect. Would the minister tell the committee if the bill has been submitted to the Justice department and a satisfactory assurance given with respect to it? Because the matter is apparently a technical one having to do with the administration of the law.

Mr. BUREAU: In cases where a junior chemist or one of the chemists in the department made an analysis the judge of the court refused to accept the certificate because the term "departmental analyst" was defined in the act and the junior chemist or officers of a lower grade were not included. Moreover the old clause only applied to prosecutions under this section. It is proposed to make a new definition of "analyst" which will include any employee classified as junior chemist, assistant chemist or chemist in a laboratory in the Department of Customs and Excise or of any department of the government, and this will apply to all prosecutions under the act. The definition will be general in its application.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Tobacco cultivated for private use.

Mr. STEVENS: What has made this necessary?

Mr. BUREAU: This is made necessary for the following reasons: In 1914 the act was amended, and in subsection 3 of section 27, the rate was changed from five cents to ten cents. In 1918 the subsection was further amended and the amount was increased from ten cents to twenty cents. On both occasions it was forgotten that there was another section purporting to have the same effect. That section is useless, it only creates confusion, and we are asking that it be repealed.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 190, to amend the Companies Act.

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

[Mr. Stevens.]

On section 2—When company may be created a private company:

Mr. STEVENS: This is apparently a very important bill. I notice the minister has it very well prepared, the explanatory notes being printed on the opposite page, but I think it would be wise to have an explanation as each clause is called whether it is asked for or not. We do not want to interrupt too much, but any important changes ought to be carefully explained. This is one of our most important statutes. Personally I have not had time to go over the bill, and I have not gathered what these changes really mean.

Mr. COPP: The matter has received very careful consideration at the hands of the legal branch of the department, and we also took the trouble of referring the bill to a large number of corporation lawyers in different parts of the country, particularly Montreal and Toronto, for consideration. The majority of the sections make really only verbal changes and the idea is to have them conform with other sections passed when the act was formerly amended. In section 43c of the principal act a private company is defined, but there is no provision for the creation of a private company. The present section simply provides for the creation of a private company that is already defined in that section.

Section agreed to.

On section 5, subsection 1—Issue of shares without nominal or par value.

Mr. STEVENS: This clause is either new or it is a departure from the old act. Will the minister give an explanation of it?

Mr. COPP: The amending act of 1917 provided for the issue of shares without nominal or par value. This is a method of company organization which has prevailed for many years on the continent of Europe. After a prolonged consideration and discussion, the first legislation authorizing shares without par value was introduced in the state of New York in the year 1912. It was from this statute that the amending act of 1917 was adopted. Even at that time the legislation was, to some extent, experimental. It was doubtful whether complications would arise in the organization of companies under these provisions and whether they would meet with the approval of financial interests. In the United States the legislation has been very successful, and the number of companies having shares without par value is steadily increasing. Many of them are quoted on the exchanges, and it is quite apparent that this method meets business interests.

Since 1917 this legislation has developed in the United States. Moreover it has been found that this development has been due to business requirements. The principal change has been brought about to meet the following circumstances.

As the act stood in the amendment of 1917, a company could not commence business until the total amount of its preferred shares of $5 on each share without par value had been subscribed and paid up. In cases of reorganization this created no difficulty, but it largely prevented new enterprises being undertaken under this method. The regulations of the Department of the Interior require that all oil companies holding leases in the Northwest Territories must be incorporated under this provision. For such companies this section created almost impossible difficulties.

Under the section as amended, section 26 of the act is applicable under paragraph (b) of subsection 4, and the company may commence business as soon as 10 per cent of its capital is subscribed. This would, undoubtedly, mean 10 per cent of the preferred shares and one tenth of the number of shares without nominal or par value.

Moreover, under the amending act of 1917 there was some doubt whether preferred shares without par value could be issued. Many of the companies' acts of the different states provide for preferred shares without par value where the preference is only to the extent of dividend. The section, as amended by the bill, also permits the issue of such shares. Subsection 7b was taken, with verbal alterations, from the legislation of the state of New York for the year 1912. This has been the law of several of the states in the United States since 1912. This section is intended to give us a little more definite information as to the working of the act.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Can the minister say that this provision would probably be applied in the case of the Dome Mines Company and the Ontario Gold Fields in Porcupine?

Mr. COPP: I think the section will apply.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will it apply to the case which has been before the public in connection with the Dome Mines of Porcupine?

Mr. COPP: I am informed that company would come under it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Then it may be a good measure, though I think perhaps it is more in the interest of booming the stock market than anything else. If there is a company in regard to which inflation might be justifiable it is this company which has one of the richest mines in Porcupine. Its capital stock, as I understood, consisted of $5 shares paid up, and not long ago the company repaid a one dollar capital bonus to the shareholders. Now you propose to declare these shares to be of no par value. This clause is introducing an absolutely new factor. I want it clearly understood that from my point of view, though it may be a good measure, it is more or less for the advantage of those who deal with these stocks on the market, and the net result, as it affects this mine, will be that while these shares run to $30 and $40, by possible inflation these shares will go to two and three times their present values on the stock market. As long as the public know that this is the object of the proposition, perhaps it is all right, but it should be carefully considered, because if we introduce this provision, then in all the prosperous mines this conversion will take place and they will be issuing no par value shares, and one man will have five no par value shares where at the commencement he had only one five dollar share. The net result will be that the Dome Mine shares, which are now quoted at $30 or $40, may go to four times that amount. I hope the result will justify the bill, but it is a new departure, and it is following the American practice. If we are to follow the American practice, the matter must be looked into carefully and the public ought to know what the object of the amendment really is.

Mr. STEVENS: When the minister is dealing with that point, will he make this further point clear: In the case of a company issuing no par value shares, is it necessary under this section that before any such block of shares may be issued it must clearly set forth, either in a registered agreement or in the letters patent, the value for which the shares are to be issued.

Mr. COPP: That may be fixed in the charter or by the directors.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not may, it is "must." It must be so fixed. I am only reading this casually, but subsection 3 of section 5 says:

> (3) The issue and allotment of shares authorized by this section, other than shares of preferred stock having a preference as to principal, may be made from time to time for such consideration as may be prescribed in the letters patent, or as may be fixed by the board of directors.

When shares of no par value are issued, must the aggregate amount of money or value be set forth in the letters patent? Is it obligatory?

Mr. COPP: It is not obligatory to set it out in the letters patent, but it may be fixed by the board of directors.

Mr. STEVENS: Then it is not necessary to disclose it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No, and in no way will the public know what the actual issue of shares of the company was in connection with the shares now converted. There is a conversion to shares of no par value, and it may be a justifiable conversion. In the case of the Dome Mines it was a five dollar proposition when the shares were issued, together with a one dollar bonus. These shares may each be converted into four shares I think the public should know about this conversion, so that when they are purchasing no par value shares they will have some idea what they are dealing in. I am quite sure that all the high-priced and successful stock mining companies will take advantage of this provision, and there will be a great inflation of the value of these shares. Let there be inflation, but I think the public ought to know, by some declaration or record made by the company, what the shares are worth and what their original value was and how much has been paid on them in each particular company. They should know the original amount of capital that these shares represent to the company. It is only fair to the public that some statement of that kind should be provided, because, if it is not, you will see a wide conversion of the capital stock, especially of these mining companies, there will be a complete change, and shares will be dealt in which have no par value, nominally at least; but still they have a value.

Mr. COPP: The Dome Mine my hon. friend referred to is not affected by this section any more than any other company. After the organization of the company and when they proceed to sell the stock, the information is all set out in the prospectus. To-day, under the old act, they have the privilege of issuing no par value stock in that way. This does not change to any extent the situation as we have it to-day, and it is not the purpose to interfere with or change the organization of any particular mine or company. Of course this bill will apply to any mining or other company in the future.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The effect of that is that soon we shall have an issue of no par value government bonds. Where is this to end in the issue of stock of no par value? This may be all right in mines, and it may be perfectly justified in the case of this particular mine. I will not say that it is a danger; but it is a principle that must be carefully guarded, and while I do not say that the minister can guard it at the present moment, I suggest to him that he should give the matter further consideration later on. I am sure there will be an agitation in this country for a clearer definition of what a no par value share is, and in that way the public can be protected. With that suggestion I am going to leave the matter, but I hope the minister will take it into consideration.

Mr. COPP: I shall be glad to take the matter into consideration. I do not know that I can do so just as this moment.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The matter will certainly come up again.

Mr. BAXTER: I think sometimes from the public standpoint the no par value share has an advantage over the par value share. When the par value share is used, there is an assumption, for instance, that a $100 share has $100 behind it. One is apt to criticize anything that may have the appearance of deceiving the public, and that is quite right. When you issue no par value stock, there is no deception, because a stockholder is entitled simply to an aliquot part of the total assets or surplus. There is nothing on his certificate or in the external record of the company to deceive anyone. There is no misleading on the face of the certificate. You are not handed a certificate with a gilt seal on it and a statement that this represents $100. The certificate states simply that you are entitled to a share, without the value being indicated.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): In view of stock operations of this kind, the matter should be put into concrete form. Heretofore, there was supposed to be some protection as to the amount of money involved in the certificate, but clearly we are having an absolute change in this matter. I say that this should be very carefully looked into, and if the bill is passed, should be passed with the reservation that later on it may be in the interest of the public more clearly to define the rights of the public in connection with these issues.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 5, subsection 4—Amount of capital required.

Mr. COPP: I move to amend this subsection by striking out the words "received as" and inserting instead thereof the words "of the." The subclause will then read:

The amount of capital with which the company shall carry on business shall be not less than the aggregate amount of the consideration for the issue—

And so on.

Mr. BAXTER: The consideration may not necessarily be money; it may be property?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): When a prosperous company like this issues more stock, it will give the buyers shares of no par value, and that may be a good proposition; but it is a proposition that should be carefully defined, and the rights of the public should be protected in some way. The public should know that, at least, they are protected in connection with mining companies in this country where the stock is set out to be of no par value. Perhaps, as my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) has said, it may be a good thing to do away with these gilt seals on certificates, and where there is a large amount stated as capital, the public will be, perhaps, more careful hereafter. If this is done, it must be carefully watched, and it may be necessary to change the legislation later on.

Subsection agreed to.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Company may obtain change of name.

Mr. COPP: I move to amend this clause by striking out the words "in value of the shares represented" and substituting in place thereof the words "of the votes cast."

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Can the shareholders vote by proxy?

Mr. COPP: Yes, just the same as before.

Mr. BAXTER: Has the minister had in mind the possibility of a company regulating its voting powers by by-law, as I think they do under the Dominion act? As long as the method is "one share, one vote," which is the normal principle, this is all right; but what would be the effect, if, for instance, in some way, a shareholder had to have ten shares in order to have one vote, and then receive so many votes for each additional share, or some scheme like that? I am not quite sure how that would work out. The wording "two-thirds of the votes cast" would seem to be a protection, but it might be very difficult to do the business the company desires.

Mr. COPP: I am informed that this makes it easier. This is the statement in regard to the matter. It refers to a number of sections, and I may not refer to them all. The memorandum reads:

Sections 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 23 are all for the purpose of unifying and simplifying the phraseology defining the vote at special meetings of shareholders in certain cases. As the act stood, the phraseology was not uniform. For instance, section 34 provides for a vote of shareholders "representing at least two-thirds in value of the subscribed stock." Section 44 provides for a vote of "not less than two-thirds in value of the capital stock represented at a meeting." This phrase is doubtful because it is open to two constructions, whether it is two-thirds of all the subscribed capital or two-thirds of those represented at the meeting.

The situation is rendered more difficult in the case of companies having shares without par value. It is then impossible to comply with the provisions of these sections. A further complication arises where preferred shares are issued without any right to vote.

It is considered advisable to make the language uniform and to provide that the resolution or by-law is to be carried by two-thirds of the votes at the meeting. The charter and by-laws define who should be entitled to vote. Everyone entitled to vote must be given notice of the meeting, and it seems preferable that the control should be placed in the hands of those present or represented at the meeting to the extent of two-thirds.

That refers to all the sections.

Mr. BAXTER: I think it is good. I am entirely in accord with the legislation so far as it is directed to having one uniform rule whereas, as the minister has stated, we have heretofore had more or less conflicting practices. If I may say so, we had some sections of rather doubtful interpretation. What I am trying to point out, however, is this: If a company is to take action under the voting power of the shares it might make it somewhat difficult to apply this section. The section must be broad enough to apply to non-par value as well as to the ordinary class of shares. The words "in value" might therefore very well be left out. But still I think that the phrase "two-thirds of the shares represented," would be the best expression. I would suggest two-thirds of the shares represented, whether par value or non-par value; that would be dealing with the very structure of the company itself. This would make it impossible to have any interference by special by-laws that might restrict voting powers and you would really have one uniform rule, instead of allowing companies to do something that might to a certain extent interfere with the general principle proposed. The words "in value" do not really mean anything, because a man would have equal voting power, even though his share were not paid up, with the man whose shares were paid up. The words "two-thirds of the shares represented," whether par value or non-par value, would go to the very root of the voting structure of the company, and I would suggest to the minister that expression.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I still think that the committee should give the proposed legislation the fullest consideration and time given to the public interested in such non-par value securities to look into it.

Mr. COPP: I do not think that the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John would make very much difference.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps some of the shareholders might lie back quietly and take an attitude of indifference. They might say that they do not care how the thing is run. We do not want that, and I think it is too much to ask that two-thirds of the total capital or total number of shares should be represented. All the shares might not be represented at any meeting, but there should be a vote from at least two-thirds of those who are actually present, and unless you can secure a vote from two-thirds of the shares represented then an important change should not be made. Some shareholders might say, "Well, you people called the meeting and now we are here we shall sit back as spectators and see how far you will get"; but two-thirds of the votes cast would decide the matter.

Mr. COPP: I have no particular objection to the amendment my hon. friend proposes, but I really do not think it makes very much difference. The matter has been carefully considered by the department.

Mr. STEVENS: Is this the principle that runs through all the sections of the bill, namely, that two-thirds of the votes cast will decide any question?

Mr. COPP: Yes, that is the principle.

Mr. BAXTER: It seems to me that "two-thirds of the shares represented" would express as accurately as possible what it is intended to convey.

Mr. COPP: I move then that the section be amended by striking out the words "in value" in line 37.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—Commission for procuring subscriptions.

Mr. COPP: This is a new provision taken from the English act.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it an exact copy from the English act?

Mr. COPP: It is taken wholly from a corresponding section in the English act which allows a company to pay a commission on the shares it may sell. It is a universal practice, and while there is some doubt as to its legality, it is considered well to regulate the practice.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Repeal.

Mr. COPP: The section which is being repealed provides that the situation of the office or head office shall be published in the Canada Gazette. It is always published when the letters patent are received, and the present provision calls for a publication if any supplementary letters are issued.

Mr. BAXTER: That is, a separate publication?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Company may authorize directors to apply to extend or reduce powers.

Mr. COPP: The principle in this section is the same as that in section 6. I move that the words "in value" in line 18 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 11—How private company may become public company.

Mr. COPP: The words "in value" should also be deleted from this section.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 13—Requirements as to particulars in prospectus.

Mr. STEVENS: What is new in this section?

Mr COPP: Instead of requiring that the objects of the company be set out in detail in the prospectus this amendment permits a summary.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—Conditions on which company may purchase stock of other companies.

Mr. COPP: The words "in value" should be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—By-law to be sanctioned.

Mr. COPP: The words "in value" should be stricken from this section too.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not think there is any change in the last lines of this clause, "or

until the same shall be unanimously sanctioned in writing by the shareholders of the company." This is the present law, but as there is no provision for authenticating the act of the individual shareholders, I doubt whether there is any value in the words I have quoted and I think they might be struck out.

Mr. COPP: I beg to move that the words:

—or until the same shall be unanimously sanctioned in writing by the shareholders of the company.

be stricken out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 18, subsection 1—Increase of capital.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not see any point in fixing the percentage at ninety.

Mr. COPP: Many requests have been made to fix it at even less than ninety.

Mr. BAXTER: That is what I would think.

Mr. COPP: We thought we had better leave it at that arbitrary figure.

Mr. STEVENS: As the law now stands it assumes that a company will not increase its capital until it has virtually exhausted its treasury stock. But that may not be the reason at all. A company may organize, for instance, with a capital of $1,000,000 and find that that is altogether inadequate and want $5,000,000. It may be that it is unable to function simply because of the inadequacy of its capitalization, and yet it may have a perfectly good proposition and by raising its capitalization to $5,000,000 be able to function properly and sell its stock. So I certainly think that that arbitrary figure of ninety per cent is not wise. It is not based I think on any sound principle in practice.

9 p.m.

Mr. COPP: What would my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. STEVENS: I think sixty per cent would be ample, but I do not know that there is any need of fixing a figure at all, because this is assuming that there is only one reason for increasing capital, namely, that they had exhausted the assets in the treasury. But that may not be the reason at all. The common reason is that either because of expansion of business it is desirable to increase the capitalization, or because the capitalization is insufficient to realize what they anticipated in the way of provision for business. So unless there be some definite objection I see no reason why it should not be reduced to fifty per cent in both cases.

Mr. COPP: I see no reason for retaining that figure. We have had many requests to reduce it to fifty per cent, but ninety per cent was in the old act and we have left it in

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Where did the requests come from, and what reasons did they give for asking the change?

Mr. COPP: This has not been changed. Many lawyers suggested that it be reduced to a lower percentage. I have no objection to making it fifty per cent, and I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. COPP: I move that the words "in value" in line 13, subsection 2 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 19—Borrowing powers.

Mr. COPP: I am adding a new clause 19 and renumbering the present section 19 and following sections. The new clause which I now move will read as follows:

No by-law for reducing the capital stock of the company shall have any force or effect whatsoever until it is approved by at least two-thirds of the votes cast at a special general meeting of the company duly called to consider the same and afterwards confirmed by supplementary letters patent.

The old act read:

No by-law for reducing the capital stock of the company, or for subdividing the shares, shall have any force or effect whatsoever, until it is approved by the votes of shareholders representing at least two-thirds in value of the subscribed stock of the company at a special general meeting of the company duly called for considering the same, and afterwards confirmed by supplementary letters patent.

We can change the amendment to read two-thirds of the shares represented, to make it conform with the other sections.

Mr. BAXTER: I was just going to ask the minister as to that. In the other cases I do not think you could do any harm, but when you deal with a reduction of capital it may work in two ways: You may have a reduction of capital because the company is contracting its business but is yet solvent, and you may have a reduction of capital for the purpose of trying to avoid liability. Of course, the sanction of the minister has to be obtained I believe, but it is a question of whether there might not be some different rule in regard to the shareholders in this case. I submit that for consideration.

Mr. COPP: If we make it two-thirds the sections would then be uniform. I do not think there is any danger.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the wording the minister proposes?

Mr. COPP: The amendment reads:

No by-law for reducing the capital stock of the company shall have any force or effect whatsoever until it is approved by at least two-thirds of the votes cast at a special general meeting of the company duly called to consider the same and afterwards confirmed by supplementary letters patent.

We can make that two-thirds of the shares represented to conform with the other sections.

The CHAIRMAN: It is proposed that section 19 be struck out and the amendment submitted be substituted therefor. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to call the minister's attention to what appears to be a mistake in the motion put by the chairman. I do not think the minister intends to strike out the clause, does he?

Mr. COPP: No, it is a new clause to be added.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amended clause to be known as section 19.

Mr. STEVENS: You want that to harmonize with the others, do you not? Are you not going to strike out the words "in value"?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 19 as amended carry?

Section as amended agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Then section 19 appearing in the bill will now be section 20 and the following sections will be renumbered.

On section 20—Borrowing powers.

Mr. COPP: I move to strike out the words "in value" in line 23 of the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The original section 20 is now section 21.

On section 21—Dividends payable out of funds when assets of a wasting character.

Mr. STEVENS: We ought to have an explanation as apparently this is a new section.

Mr. COPP: Section 70 of the principal act reads as follows:

No dividend shall be declared which will impair the capital of the company.

That is the whole section. Now, companies such as mining companies have wasting assets because their value is decreasing as the mines are worked. This section makes provision to pay the dividends out of the profits made even if, to a certain extent, the assets are wasting.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why was the doubt raised about this? I think there is a little danger in it because where you have wasting assets, and there is a bond issue, there must always be a sinking fund. Some directors might think this provision would relieve them of the necessity of providing a sinking fund. I cannot understand how doubts could ever have been raised about the law as it stands at present.

Mr. COPP: The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) introduced a private bill dealing with this subject earlier in the session and as we decided to introduce some general amendments the provision was incorporated in the present bill. It was brought to my attention that doubt has arisen in the minds of the directors of some mining companies and that is why this particular legislation is required. There is a clause in the Ontario act covering the same point.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would ask the Secretary of State whether he does not think this bill should be reprinted and circulated a day or two in advance of its being taken up in the Senate? Then those who are interested in the measure—and there is a very large interest growing up in this country in connection with our mines—and the general public, will have an opportunity of learning exactly what is contemplated. These changes are being made just at the end of the session and inasmuch as the House will be sitting for a considerable part if not all of next week, by the reprinting and circulation of the bill those interested and the general public will have an opportunity of studying the changes and if any objection is taken it can be given expression to in the Senate later on. Has the Secretary of State any objection to that course being pursued?

Mr. COPP: I have no objection at all but I hardly see the necessity for it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): As I understand the bill it is far reaching in its effects.

Mr. COPP: I do not think it is. However, if the committee thinks it better to have the bill reprinted I will give the matter consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The advantage will be that those interested will have an opportunity of studying what is proposed before the bill passes its final stage in the Senate.

Mr. STEVENS: I had not had time to read the clause when I asked the minister a question. Now I clearly see the force of what is proposed and I must say I am thoroughly satisfied with this amendment which seems to be in the interest of mining companies.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does my hon friend object to my proposition for the bill to be reprinted and circulated so that the public will be given time to consider it?

Mr. STEVENS: Not at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I hope the Secretary of State will consent to that being done.

Mr. COPP: The bill will be reprinted before it goes to the Senate.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—Qualifications of directors elected.

Mr. BAXTER: The first subsection seems to be all right but I cannot say the same of subsection 2 as to the requirements on the part of the person to be named as director. When are we going to get rid of this minute in our legislation? The subsection reads as follows:

(2) A person named as a director or proposed director in any prospectus or in any statement in lieu of prospectus, issued by or on behalf of the company, shall not be capable of being appointed director of the company, unless, at the time of the publication of the prospectus or statement in lieu of prospectus, he has by himself or by his agent authorized in writing,—

(i) Signed and filed with the Secretary of State of Canada a consent in writing to act as such director; and

(ii) Either signed the petition for incorporation and memorandum of agreement and stock book for a number of shares not less than his qualification or signed and filed with the Secretary of State of Canada a contract in writing to take from the company and pay for his qualification shares.

It is owing to requirements such as this that we find when we come to consider the estimates of civil government such an appalling number of filing clerks and other unnecessary officials foisted upon the country I am going to ask the minister to display a little common sense, and let a company do its own business.

Mr. COPP: This is an exact copy of the provision in the act of 1917—

Mr. BAXTER: It was a very bad House that passed it.

Mr. COPP: I am not making that as an argument, but with a single verbal change it is exactly the provision we have been working under since 1917. The change just seeks to correct one word in the existing act. This clause is a substantial part of the legislation respecting prospectuses which has been in force in England, and many of the provinces for twenty years, and the elimination of this clause would perhaps nullify the prospectus clauses.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not think you ought to have it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): In view of the government's desire to reach prorogation at an early stage I think this bill ought to be reprinted forthwith and copies furnished to the public so that they will see exactly what is proposed. They would also have the benefit of reading this discussion.

Subsection 1 agreed to.

On section 23—By-laws for increase or decrease of number.

Mr. COPP: I move that the words "in value" in line 34 of this section be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section agreed to.

On section 25—Annual meeting.

Mr. BAXTER: What is the verbal change there?

Mr. COPP In the 1917 act the words were —"the place named in the special act or letters patent as the place of." These words are struck out.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Amounts in annual return.

Mr. COPP: There is a change in the wording here—just a transposition of the words. The old section reads:

The total amount paid on shares otherwise than in cash, showing severally the amount paid by services commissions or assets acquired since the last annual return.

Section agreed to.

On section 27—Subscriptions in return.

Mr. BAXTER: What is the change?

Mr. COPP: The old section read:

The total amount paid on such shares.

We are adding the words "of subscriptions."

Mr. BAXTER: Are you making it any better? If you pay the money in you are paying it on account of the shares.

Mr. COPP: They might make payments annually.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the wording of the new section is not nearly as good as the old. I think it is making it more obscure.

Mr. COPP: I do not think it makes any difference.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not like to quibble over it, but I cannot see any improvement.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think there is a little improvement. In the first place the section is designed to obtain information as to payments on shares other than in cash, and if you take the words of the old section it might have reference to notes given in payment which would not be cash.

Section agreed to.

On section 28—Summary to be filed, signed and verified.

Mr. BAXTER: What is the change there?

Mr. COPP: This section says:

(2) The said summary must be completed and filed in duplicate in the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada on or before the first day of June aforesaid. Each of the said duplicates shall be signed by the president and the manager, or, if these are the same person, by the president and by the secretary of the company, and shall be duly verified by their affidavits. Provided that if one or both of such officers be unable to sign the said summary on account of absence or any other cause, the summary shall be signed instead by such other director or directors as shall be authorized thereto by the company and the affidavit of verification of the signature of each such substitute director shall include an explanation of the reason for failure of the absent or incapable officer to sign and of the authority of such substitute so to act. The said affidavits shall also verify that the copies of the said summary are duplicates.

This provision is made in case the president or other officer is absent and cannot sign. In that case, some director can do it.

Mr. BAXTER: All right.

Section agreed to.

On section 29—Meetings of creditors ordered by Secretary of State. When compromise binding on all creditors.

Mr. COPP: I move in amendment to section 29, that the original section 28 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

112A. (1) Where a compromise or arrangement is proposed between a company and its shareholders or any class of them affecting the rights of shareholders or any class of them, under the company's letters patent or supplementary letters patent or by-laws, the Secretary of State may on application in a summary way of the company, or of any shareholder, order a meeting of the shareholders of the company or of any class of shareholders, as the case may be, to be summoned in such manner as the Secretary of State directs.

Mr. BAXTER: I understand it. I tried to give a little attention to this and there are three classes dealt with. The first is where there were some compromises between the company and its shareholders or class of shareholders—a thing within the company. The second is where the company is being dealt with under the Winding-up Act, and, third, where it is being dealt with under the Bankruptcy Act. I think it is a perfectly proper thing for judicial sanction. I would suggest that, instead of having the Secretary of State direct the manner in which the meeting is to be summoned, it should be left to judges in the provinces where the head offices of the company are situated. Let them all be dealt with judicially. I do not think my hon. friend wants to have his department used as a half court or something of that kind. It is not at all advisable. Get some general term. It should be a judge of any superior court. I do not know whether the words "supreme court" would be the proper ones. I think it should be a judge, not necessarily of an appellate court, but of a court of the highest jurisdiction. What is a superior court judge in the province of Quebec? Where does he come in? I am trying to get a little information if the minister could give it us as to the status of the superior court judges in his province. Is that the highest rank of judge, outside of the appellate judges.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, that will be all right—a judge of the supreme or appellate court in the province in which the head office of the company is situated.

Mr. COPP: I agree. I prefer that the power be delegated to a judge.

The CHAIRMAN: I have struck out the words "the Secretary of State" in the sixth line of the amendment and substituted therefor the words "a judge of the Supreme or a superior court".

Mr. BAXTER: Of the province in which the head office of the company is situated.

The CHAIRMAN: The subclause will read in part:

A judge of the Supreme or a superior court of the province in which the head office of the company is situated, may on application in a summary way of the company or of any shareholder order a meeting of the shareholders of the company or of any class of shareholders, as the case may be, to be summoned in such manner as the said judge directs.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 2.

The CHAIRMAN (Reading):

If the shareholders, or class of shareholders, as the case may be, present in person or by proxy at the meeting, by three-fourths of the votes cast—

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister is going to use "three-fourths," we had better continue our desire for uniformity, by saying "three-fourths of the shares issued", so as to keep this uniform with the other clauses.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the words "votes cast" shall be stricken out, and the words "shares represented" inserted instead thereof. The subclause will now read:

If the shareholders, or class of shareholders, as the case may be, present in person or by proxy at the meeting, by three-fourths of the shares represented agree to the compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at such meeting, such compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by a judge as aforesaid, and if so sanctioned, such compromise or arrangement and any reduction or increase of share capital and any provisions for the allotment or disposition thereof by sale or otherwise as therein set forth, shall be confirmed by supplementary letters patent which shall be binding on the company and the shareholders or class of shareholders, as the case may be.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I should like to ask the minister if in the English Companies Act, from which this clause is apparently taken, the jurisdiction is given to the recorder or registrar there.

Mr. COPP: It is given to the courts.

Subsection 2 as amended agreed to.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: A new section is submitted to be known as section 30:

(1) Where a compromise or arrangement is proposed between a company which is subject to any pending proceedings under the Winding-Up Act chapter one hundred and forty-four of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and its creditors or any class of them or its shareholders or any class of them, affecting or cancelling, conditionally or otherwise, the rights of shareholders or any class of them under the company's letters patent or supplementary letters patent or by-laws, the court having jurisdiction in such pending proceedings as aforesaid may on application in a summary way of the company or any shareholder or liquidator order a meeting of the shareholders or class of shareholders to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

Subsection agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: As regards subsection 2, it is suggested that in line 3 the words "votes cast" shall be struck out, and the words "shares represented" be substituted therefor. Subsection 2 will read:

(2) If the shareholders or class of shareholders, as the case may be, present either in person or by proxy at the meeting, by three-fourths of the shares represented agree to a compromise or arrangement, as proposed or as altered or modified at such meeting and if the requisite majority of the creditors or class of creditors under any relative provisions of the Winding-Up Act also agree to such compromise or arrangement, the court having jurisdiction in such pending proceedings as aforesaid may sanction such compromise or arrangement, and if so sanctioned by the court, a certified copy of such compromise or arrangement as so sanctioned and of the order or judgment of the court sanctioning the same shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State, and such compromise or arrangement and any reduction or cancellation of share capital and any increase or creation of new share capital, and any provisions for the allotment or disposition thereof by sale or otherwise as therein set forth, shall be confirmed by supplementary letters patent, which shall be binding upon all the creditors or class of creditors and shareholders or class of shareholders, and on any liquidator or contributories concerned.

Should that not be "and" all the way through?

Mr. COPP: All right.

The CHAIRMAN: It will read:

And on any liquidator and contributories concerned.

Subsection agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 3 reads:

(3) Where a compromise or arrangement proposed between a company which is subject to any pending proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act, chapter thirty-six of the statutes of 1919, and its creditors or any class of them or its shareholders or any class of them, affecting or cancelling conditionally or otherwise the rights of shareholders or any class of them under the company's letters patent or supplementary letters patent or by-laws, has been approved by the court having jurisdiction in such pending proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act, a certified copy of such compromise or arrangement as so approved and of the order or judgment of the court approving the same shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State, and such compromise or arrangement and any reduction or cancellation of share capital and any increase or creation of new share capital and any provisions for the allotment or disposition thereof by sale or otherwise as therein set forth shall be confirmed by supplementary letters patent, which shall be binding upon all the creditors or class of creditors and shareholders or class of shareholders and on any custodian or trustee concerned.

Subsection agreed to.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): When the old clause 26, the new clause 27, was being considered, I spoke upon it thinking that the preceding clause was under consideration, and my remarks must have appeared unintelligible to the committee. My attention has since been called to that fact, and I do not think that the clause is very intelligible as it reads. I think it would be better to say "the total amount paid on such subscribed shares."

Mr. STEVENS: It is perfectly clear that it is the shares that you pay for.

Mr. COPP: I am prepared to accept the amendment. I move that the section be amended by striking out the words "of sub-

scriptions" and inserting after the word "such" the word "subscribed."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

LAKE GRAIN RATES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure with respect to freight rates for the carriage of grain by lake and river navigation, and to provide,—

1. That any shipping company or any shipowner or person who carries or who offers, advertises or proposes to carry grain for hire between Fort William or Port Arthur and any other port or place in Canada or the United States of America, by lake or river navigation, shall within a prescribed period file with the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada the tariff of rates which is proposed to be charged, and also any change or variation of such tariff of rates.

2. That the said board shall receive and tabulate all such tariffs and rates, and ascertain by all available means the rates of freight which prevail or are exacted for the carriage of grain as aforesaid, and report to the minister the facts in respect to deficiency of cargo space, excessive freight charge, or discrimination in rates, and all shippers shall upon request furnish the board with such information as they possess relating to these matters.

3. That when in the opinion of the board the rates are unreasonable and excessive, the board may prescribe such maximum rates as it may consider reasonable, which may be varied or limited in their operation as the board may prescribe.

4. That provisions be made as to the posting in the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and in the office of the Board of Grain Commissioners by vessel brokers and agents of statements in detail of cargo space, time for shipment and destination on contracts or charters made on the day last preceding, and to prohibit any vessel broker or agent from soliciting any risk, or issuing or delivering any receipt or policy of insurance, or collecting or receiving any premium in whole or in part, or inspecting any risk or adjusting any loss upon any consignment of grain to be carried.

5. That penalties be enacted for the violation of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

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

Mr. STEVENS: This is a very important resolution, dealing with a matter of more than passing concern both to the country and to the various interests affected I do not rise at all for the purpose of unfairly or unkindly criticizing the resolution, but I am anxious to have as much information as possible on a number of questions. I trust therefore that the minister will not feel that I am in any way trying to embarrass him. If the questions I ask do not seem particularly relevant to the first subsection under consideration I would ask that they be allowed notwithstanding that fact, because the whole discussion might very well centre to a large extent around the first section. First of all, I should like to know what reason there is for submitting to the Grain Commission rather than to the Railway Board the question as to the fixation of lake rates. The Grain Commission have no machinery, nor have they experts as in an established department; whereas the Railway Board, having the advantage of many years' experience, and equipped with the necessary technical and clerical machinery, are well organized and able to study any question of this kind. First of all the minister might outline the reasons why this important matter should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Grain Commissioners rather than before the Railway Board.

Mr. ROBB: The Grain Commission have charge of the handling of grain, and are in touch with the elevators at the head of the lakes and the interior elevators. Furthermore, they have a perfect knowledge of the grain, first back in the country and next at the terminal elevators at the head of the lakes and in the elevators east of them. The bill to be introduced based upon this resolution provides not only for the fixing of the maximum rate, but for the regulation of the method of shipping and for the advising of the public as to space available. Early last summer, I think in the month of July, the government had complaints from certain shippers, some of them large shippers, that there was discrimination in the freight rates on the upper lakes as between Canadian and United States ports. There was a difference of opinion between the shippers and the lake carriers. The government tried to induce the lake carriers to remove this discrimination, which they themselves admitted. The carriers, however, contended that the rates quoted to Buffalo were what are known as "distress" rates; on account of strikes in the United States in the coal areas many vessels that otherwise would be carrying coal and iron were offering to carry freight from Fort William and Port Arthur to Buffalo at very much lower rates than the rates charged generally by Canadian companies. We urged upon the Canadian companies that if they could afford to carry grain to Buffalo at rates they themselves admitted, they should at least carry it to Port Colborne at a very small percentage over those rates. The experience of past years was that, generally speaking, they got a quarter of a cent a bushel more to Port Colborne than to Buffalo; in some cases the rate charged was considerably more—almost double. Unfortunately we were unable to induce them to deal fairly

with Canadian shippers, there being no machinery that we could invoke for the purpose.

Now, based upon this resolution a bill will be introduced providing that shipowners and ship brokers shall file with the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada the rates at which they charter vessels. It will be the duty of the board to secure such information and have it on file for the minister. Certain penalties will be imposed upon shipowners who refuse to file their rates. I may say that they now give this information to our statistical department, but it comes to us too late to be of any use. If in the judgment of the board the rates charged out of Fort William or Port Arthur are excessive as compared with the rates charged for similar traffic from United States ports, it will be within its power to fix a maximum rate. Of course, this power must be exercised with discretion. A maximum rate must be a fair rate based upon the traffic available for the ships that are doing business. If this maximum rate is fixed too high, the shipowner may consider it the minimum rate; on the other hand, if it is fixed too low it may drive shipping away altogether from Canadian ports over to Duluth, and it might divert our grain to that port, or the shipowner might tie up his vessels. I admit at once that in my judgment we cannot compel any shipowner to run his boats if he is not satisfied with the maximum rate we fix. Therefore, as I say, care and discretion must, and we expect will, be exercised in this regard. We believe that the Board of Grain Commissioners at the head of the lakes, being conversant with the conditions of the grain trade from day to day, are in a much better position to handle this rate question intelligently than a board located at Ottawa far away from the scene of operations. This is one reason which induced the government to select the Board of Grain Commissioners for this purpose.

Right here I may say that in addition to these powers the bill will provide for the preventing of what is regarded by the producers and shippers of grain as an unfair method of booking space; that is, of the vessel broker or agent saying to the shipper: "Unless you take insurance with me you cannot have the space you require." We propose to get rid of this trouble by prohibiting the broker or agent from either writing the insurance or inspecting any risk.

This, generally speaking is an outline of the bill. The government invites advice from the House. We do not believe that this proposal will be a cure-all, but it is an honest effort, through publicity primarily, to obtain reasonable rates for the shippers of grain.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are there any penalties besides publicity?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, quite severe penalties. We do not want to go through the experience of last season. Early in the season it was complained that there was discrimination as between Canadian and United States ports; later on the complaint was that the rates were unduly advanced. As regards the latter complaint, I am bound to say that from the information I have gathered the blame was not all on one side. I understand the exporters sold for export large quantities of grain without taking the precaution of securing lake space. They bought their ocean space and intended to route the grain by Buffalo to American ports. As soon as the coal strike was settled and cars were requisitioned to carry coal, Buffalo fell down and instead of putting out a thousand cars a day the number fell to about two hundred, and, of course, Buffalo became congested. Thereupon the grain was brought around to Montreal and Quebec and the exporters put their brokers in the pit and offered the shipowners advanced rates. As a result a good many of the exporters lost money, particularly the United States exporters. Now, while the exporters lost money on the grain exported early in the year, the loss backed up on the crop in the country and depressed the price of the grain which later came on the market. We are attempting to regulate this traffic so there will be more reasonable rates for the carriage of grain, and so that the shippers will have every day during the shipping season at Fort William, Port Arthur and Winnipeg information as to what space has been booked and what is still available. We hope through publicity—which after all is the great curative agency—that the rates prevailing during the coming season will be fairer than they were last season.

Mr. STEVENS: Did not the government have power last year to suspend the coasting laws?

Mr. ROBB: That power was exercised by our predecessors under the War Measures Act, and we exercised it last year, to cover grain carried across the lakes for storage so that we might have the business for our own railways. But if the matter had been taken to the courts I am not sure whether our action could have been upheld.

Mr. STEVENS: If there is discrimination against Canadian ports in relation to the rates obtaining to American ports, is not that

the obvious and quickest method of overcoming it? Under this legislation you cannot empower the Grain Commission to
10 p.m. fix a rate from Fort William to Buffalo, or from Duluth to Port Colborne. To put it another way, it will be impossible for parliament to confer power on the Grain Commission to fix rates from a Canadian port to an American port or vice versa. Now if we recognize that, then there is but very little force in the law to fix it from one Canadian port to another, because the diversion from the Canadian port to the American port will then follow as a natural sequence to the limit of the capacity of the American receiving ports. I think that is obvious. The only remedy would be to suspend the coasting laws. Then you effectively cover the discrimination or the excess rate. What I am trying to impress upon the minister, and what I really think the committee should consider, is whether it is advisable at all to frame a law which may give the impression that you are going to deal with a problem but which in its essence will not deal with the problem at all. That is, I think, the point we ought to consider in this committee, and it is a very important consideration.

I do not want to embarrass the minister with too many questions, but he is well acquainted with this matter and will follow me, and then I shall not have to bother him so much later on. Take the question of demurrage. If the Board of Grain Commissioners is to have power to fix rates they certainly will have to take into consideration the question of demurrage. Now I submit this, that no shipping company can possibly gauge or anticipate what would be an exactly fair rate unless it knows what the demurrage is going to be. If they take a chance on demurrage and the demurrage seems to be threatening seriously, the rates are going to go up. There is no question about that. It is the only protection the shipping company has. So if a shipping company anticipating a demurrage increases its rate for its own protection, which it would have a right to do, the Grain Board might step in and say: Your rates are too high, and it would reduce the rates and the shipping company would lose unfairly because of demurrage over which it has no control at all. These, I think, are very important considerations.

While I have the most profound sympathy with the desire to lower the cost of transportation I am very, very doubtful if you are going to do it by this bill at all. In fact, I really think that the net result of this bill will be to maintain generally speaking a higher rate. As it is to-day there have been and very frequently are periods when rates are abnormally low. Then occasionally like last year there comes a period when the rate is abnormally and perhaps unfairly high, but these periods of excessively high rates are comparatively rare, so that in the main I think in the past the lower rates have fairly well compensated for the higher. But if you give power to a commission such as the Grain Board to fix rates I am firmly convinced of this from my study of the question, and this same problem was threshed out in the House on several occasions in years gone by, that the average cost for transporting grain over the Great Lakes year in and year out will be higher than if there were no fixation of rates. What I do think is this, that the minister or the government could adequately and safely provide against these abnormal, excessive rates in occasional periods by a vigorous yet careful application of the suspension of the coasting laws. Let it be clearly understood and known that that may happen; let that weapon be ready at hand and be looked upon as a remedy.

The minister perhaps has already given consideration to all these points. I would like to ask him to give to the committee the fullest possible information and answer to these suggestions because to me they are very important. I am very, very much afraid that the net result of this legislation in its working out will be to make the average rate year in and year out higher than it has been in the past.

Mr. ROBB: I am not finding much fault with the observations of my hon. friend. I thought I had made it clear that in my judgment the power of fixing a maximum rate would have to be exercised with great discretion and only after very careful consideration. If the resolution itself does not say so, the bill provides that the Grain Commissioners have that power, but I have tried to make it clear that the power should only be exercised after the most careful consideration because I realize, as my hon. friend has said, that there is a possibility of driving shipping away from our ports. If my hon. friend will look at the very next item on the order paper he will observe that my colleague the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is providing for an amendment to the Shipping Act which will give us the very power he is now advocating, so that we shall then have two levers. We shall have the right to suspend the coasting laws, and we shall have this machinery here to give the fullest

publicity to rates. We believe that these two will go a long way towards giving the producer a fair deal.

Mr. MILLAR: May I point out in reply to what my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has said that at the present time the American government are exercising a similar power of fixing a maximum rate. It does not apply to bulk freight, I believe, but to other freight.

There is also this point: During the last shipping season the rates between Canadian ports were higher than the rates from Canadian ports to American ports. Also the rates charged by Canadian boats from one Canadian point to another Canadian point were higher than those charged between American points. While some are under the impression that this power ought to be placed in the hands of the Railway Commission it seems to me that it would work much better if it were placed in the hands of the Board of Grain Commissioners, and for this reason: The Board of Grain Commissioners are more closely in touch with the producers, and the producers are practically the only losers when rates go astray as they did last session. Whenever the rates go astray the producers are practically the only losers.

Mr. ROBB: I would not admit that they were the only losers last year.

Mr. MILLAR: Let me follow that up. The price of the grain that we sell, even though it may be sold right at the elevator, is based on the price of the same grain at Liverpool or London less all the costs of transportation, insurance, and so forth. If you will read carefully the report of the Grain Commission which has just been handed in you will find this statement: That so far as insurance is concerned the shippers do not care very much what insurance they pay so long as they can get as good a rate as their competitors. In a report that was handed in by the commission that investigated the grain trade in, I think, 1914—I refer to the commission appointed by the Saskatchewan government—you will also find this statement:

> That the shippers care very little what lake rates they pay provided they can get as good rates as their competitors.

Now, that is the point. Some people suppose that the shippers are very anxious to fight for low rates, but that is not the case. They care very little what the rates are so long as their competitors get no better rates than they enjoy. The Board of Grain Commissioners at the present time is composed of three men. Two of the number grew up with farming in the West, grew up with the various organizations that were established there, and I think members of this House will recognize that those who have once lived on the farm and know the difficulties that have to be overcome are likely to have a greater sympathy and understanding of the problem, and the obstacles that need to be surmounted, than those who have not had that experience. I wish to connect with this the statement I made a moment ago, that it is the producer that should be considered because practically all the losses sustained are encountered by him. The minister has just said he will not admit that is the case. I suppose he means that the shippers sometimes sustained losses last year. To a small extent that may be the case but let me point this out: I could not refer exactly to the page of the report of the commission, or to the specific statement in any investigations that have taken place, but I think it has been shown that the shippers follow this practice: If they do not know exactly what the rate is going to be and if the rate ranges from six to nine cents they will buy the grain on the basis of nine cents and if they get a lower rate than that estimated they do not suffer any loss.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. MILLAR: No, not carried yet by any means. This is too important a matter to be passed without discussion. Later perhaps, I may enter more fully into this question, show the nature of the monopoly which exists, and present a great deal more information, but as we progress now I shall only deal with one point at a time. It would seem to me to be a more rational proposition to place the control of rates under the Board of Railway Commissioners. Such a course as that would be likely to give better satisfaction and work out more successfully. Had the proposition to place the matter under the Board of Grain Commissioners been made a year and a half or three years ago before the change in the personnel of the commission took place, it would not have been received with the same approval as at present. Let me go back a great many years. I can remember the time when Mr. Castle was the warehouse commissioner and Mr. Snow, who is now on the Board of Grain Commissioners, acted as his deputy. Whenever complaints in writing were sent in by any producer, or grain handler for that matter, he was the gentleman sent at the government's expense to look into the matter and adjust the claims. There came a time after that when a commission was appointed and that com-

mission might as well have been in Jerusalem; I think the western public had practically no confidence in it. That is a strong statement to make but if hon. members had suffered as long as the western farmer has suffered by reason of neglect they perhaps would be ready to make statements just as strong. The change now accomplished has been very much for the better. I have heard the present chairman of the board spoken of very highly. I know the other two gentlemen and I have the greatest confidence in their integrity and ability. I therefore am inclined to look with favour on the placing of this matter under the Board of Grain Commissioners.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like to ask the minister what legal position he thinks the government were in last year with regard to the suspension of the coasting law? I understood him to say that the suspension under the former government was made under the War Measures Act. But there was a suspension of the coasting laws in 1913, and I understand that this government could have exercised last fall the same power that was exercised by the former government in 1913.

Mr. ROBB: The suspension of the coasting laws is not dealt with in this resolution. It will come up later in a resolution to be brought forward by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FORKE: I wish to make a few remarks at this particular time but not at any great length; we will have an opportunity of further discussion when the bill to be founded on this resolution is taken up in committee. At the risk of being tedious I must say a few words by way of introduction about the condition of the western farmer and the interest he feels in the provision of this resolution. I know that sometimes the producers of the West are very much sympathized with in this House. I should like to say, however, that, perhaps, the epic of the western prairie provinces has never yet been written. The story of the struggles, the courage, the patience, and the industry of those determined and courageous people who developed the prairies has never yet been adequately recognized. I know very well the problem to be solved is looked upon with a great deal of sympathy but sometimes, unfortunately, misstatements and misinformation distort peoples' vision so that they do not get a proper perspective.

As has already been stated, the great problem we have to deal with in the central prairie provinces is that of transportation. The agricultural potentialities of that part of Canada are great indeed but unfortunately those rich alluvial soils are located in the very centre of the Dominion and for all time to come transportation will be one of the greatest problems we shall have to solve in developing that country and furthering the prosperity of the people who live there. Last year we waged a strong fight in connection with freight rates and hon. members will not think that I am boasting if I say that we went home thoroughly satisfied with the struggle we had maintained and the conclusion come to in regard to railway rates from the West. But after producing a large crop, after having secured reduction of railway rates, what was the consternation of the people in the West when they learned that all the advantage that had been gained in that freight rate reduction was to be absorbed by an increase in lake freights.

I have listened to the remarks made by the minister (Mr. Robb) and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). Those remarks were very fair I admit and each gentleman perhaps, presented the case from his own standpoint. But we are always met with the same story when we attempt to remedy an abuse—we must be very careful for fear we shall hamper business in any way. Now, I realize the situation just as well as any hon. member of this House but I must confess I think the members of the lake shipping combine, if you will let me use the term, are quite capable of taking care of themselves. They will be able to do so no matter what kind of legislation you pass here. I have heard the same story before, it is not new to me. "That if you hamper trade we will move over to the United States and leave you in the lurch altogether." I do not think there is any danger of that. These people will stay just as long as there is any business for them to do, and they will get their share of that business and get their profits—there is no doubt about it.

Now, what happened? I am not going to review the whole situation because there will be other opportunities of doing that, but we know that at the beginning of the season the rates had been fixed at three cents per bushel from Bay ports to Buffalo. Then came this enormous crop, and we had that famous meeting that took place in Toronto in May 1922, when half a dozen shipping companies got together and formed what you may call a combine, because there is no other name that would be appropriate for it, and they agreed

to fix the rate at 7 or 8 cents immediately after. I do not think there was any congestion at Buffalo at the time these rates were increased to that amount. The rates went even higher than that. I will mention another fact in connection with the brokerage and shipping agents. As has been stated already, the brokers had claimed the right of getting the insurance when they gave space, and I think we find it in the evidence in this report,—at least the evidence was submitted, or published in the papers, during the time that commission was taking evidence—that when a shipper would go to a broker in the city of Winnipeg and ask for space, even although he knew the rate had been fixed at 3 cents, he was frequently told the rate was 7 cents, and when the question of insurance was brought up he made the remark that he was able to insure himself, and he was told, "If you do not place the insurance with me you cannot have space." We know that in the season of 1922 the brokerage agents got about $448,000 of commissions for selling insurance. As high as $2,000 commission was paid on insuring some cargoes of grain.

Mr. DUFF: Did the Winnipeg brokers charge a greater premium for this insurance than it could be got for outside?

Mr. FORKE: Just 100 per cent more than the rate which could have been obtained from private operators or companies furnishing insurance themselves. It was double in many cases. There is another peculiar situation in regard to this matter. When the question of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine came up—and I think the hon. member for Lunenburg will be wide awake now—

Mr. DUFF: I am awake all right.

Mr. FORKE: When the Canadian Government Merchant Marine came up for discussion, we were told the government had no vessels fit to carry grain. I find in the evidence submitted before the commission that at the very time the trouble was taking place on the lakes the government had 10 or 11 boats fit for carrying grain, and they had leased two grain carrying boats to one of the shipping companies in that combine. I do not know why these vessels were tied up, or not in commission, and why they were not carrying grain or doing something to break up that combination on the lakes at that particular time. Perhaps the minister will be able to give us some information on that point. I think perhaps there is an idea sometimes of driving the trade to Buffalo instead of to the Bay ports or other Canadian ports. We hear a great deal about mixing grain, and it pays the shipper sometimes to mix grain, and perhaps it is a disadvantage that our grain should be shipped by Buffalo any more than we can possibly help. I believe in letting the grain go to the ocean by the cheapest route no matter where that route is. That is the only method and system that will stand the test of time. We were told that those government vessels were unfit for carrying grain. I was rather chagrined the other day, on reading the report of the Senate proceedings, to notice that Senator Bennett had made some nice statements about my sincerity and honesty, but he was rather sorry for my ignorance in regard to this matter, because I had innocently asked if there were no Canadian boats able to carry grain. He immediately stated that there were five or six Canadian ships suited for carrying grain on the Great Lakes. I do not know the facts, but these are the statements made, and I have no doubt the speaker had some reason for making them.

Mr. ROBB: I think there were six government boats in commission last fall on the upper lakes.

Mr. FORKE: The phrase used was that they were "tied up" on the lakes.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member is quite right. They were tied up until the government came in and insisted—notwithstanding the statement that we should not interfere in their management of these roads—that these ships should be put into commission, and that was done.

Mr. FORKE: At what rate?

Mr. ROBB: The government has nothing to do with the operation of the roads. The government keeps its hands off that. That is done by the management of the railway.

Mr. FORKE: I have an idea that this Canadian Government Merchant Marine entered the combine and charged the same rates as the other boats were charging. I know there is that old school of politicians known as the Manchester School, that never believed in interference in trade but wished to remove all restrictions and allow each individual to operate for himself; claiming that everything would come right by competition. But a great deal of water has passed under the bridge since that time, and a great many things taken place that those economists knew nothing about. Combinations in restraint of trade and gigantic combines were not known in those days, and, if hon. members

will allow a vulgar phrase, sometimes you have to fight the devil with his own weapons, and when we take into consideration combinations and restrictions to prevent the free interchange of trade, it becomes absolutely necessary that there should be some law guiding and controlling freights and other methods of doing business with these combinations.

I would like to say a few words in regard to who pays the bill. I know that it gets tiresome in this House to be continually falling back on the farmer, but really, Mr. Chairman, I have forgotten all my economics if I cannot see that the cost always falls back on the producer—I do not care what line of business it is. I have had a good deal to do with business in the way of paying taxes, and I find among the men and merchants doing business on the prairies there is a great deal of grumbling about taxation. How is taxation levied? Simply on the cost of doing business, and it has to come back to the production of the soil, and the man on the farm is paying the taxes. The man on the farm in western Canada pays the bill, I do not care what restrictions you put on.

It may happen that in the raising of freight rates, or in some other way, the shipper loses money on one ship load, but, take it on the whole, the cost of doing business and the increased cost of transportation must fall back on the producer.

Last year we heard a great deal about the enormous crop produced in western Canada. We heard about 400,000,000 bushels of wheat being produced there. We were told about the great stream of wealth that flowed from the western prairie down to eastern Canada and helped to revive trade and set things moving all over the country. Is it not a tragedy, and is it not something to be sorry for when we realize that the people who raised that great amount of wealth have not reaped the benefit, and are worse off to-day than perhaps a year ago? Is it not strange that there should be perhaps a little work-up over any combination that will put a charge on every bushel of wheat the farmers produce? Already we are beginning to hear that next year we are going to produce 500,000,000 bushels of wheat; and what is happening? We find the price is dropping rapidly, on the theory that there is going to be a large production next season. No one can tell what the crops will be on the prairie. Those who know anything about western conditions will know that in two weeks' time the crops will either be made or broken, according to climatic conditions. The prospects are good to-day, but no one can tell what they will be in the month of August.

[Mr. Forke.]

I will not take up any more time at the present. We have the recommendations made by the commission which sat and took evidence in this matter. For my part, I would be inclined to accept those recommendations as they have been made by the commission. I have no fear that they will not work out to the benefit and advantage of everyone concerned. I have no fear of any commission ever fixing maximum rates at a figure that will damage lake shipping to any great extent. Producers even are reasonable, and I think they will be willing to pay a fair rate for getting their grain shipped across the Great Lakes. I shall have an opportunity of speaking to this question again. I have made only a few remarks, and I hope the committee will give the matter very serious consideration, because it affects, not only western Canada, but the prosperity of the Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I cannot profess that I know very much concerning the facts at issue in this particular matter which is before the committee, but I am somewhat perplexed as to what should be my duty upon this measure. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Forke) has minimized my difficulties in the matter, because he has hardly made reference to the legislation which is before the committee; that is, he fails to demonstrate whether or not it would be effective and, in the ultimate end, a measure in the interest of the people of Canada and in the interest of the particular class in which he is concerned.

Mr. FORKE: I failed to say that, perhaps, the publicity which will be given to the whole affair will be the best cure for the conditions complained of.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not mean to suggest that my hon. friend has yet exhausted all his arguments. I merely mean to say that, up to the point reached in his remarks, he did not touch upon those features of this proposed legislation which, to me at least, are objectionable, unless I have some explanation to the contrary. For those whose products must find their outlet to the ocean, in this particular case through the Great Lakes, I have every sympathy, and I presume every hon. gentleman in this House has. The question, however, is: Will this legislation bring about any desired end? Is it wise legislation? Ultimately, will it be in the interest of the producer, the shipper or the country generally?

Mr. HOEY: It is better than no legislation at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I doubt that very much. Ineffective legislation is frequently worse than no legislation, and I may refer to that before I take my seat. As I said before, I hardly know the facts that were revealed before the commission, but I understand that the charge is that unconscionably high rates were exacted by owners of shipping on the Great Lakes. If that is true, it was wrong, and the question before the committee is: How are we going to remedy that wrong? We ought to approach the question in that spirit, and it should not be said by hon. gentlemen who are, perhaps, particularly interested because many of their constituents are shippers, that because one is disposed to doubt the efficacy of the legislation, therefore, he is opposed to the interest of those people. I resent that form of argument, and it should not be tolerated in legislative halls. I hope it will not be too frequently made.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think I was guilty of that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, but somebody else said that. The newspapers have discussed this matter; but again I say that my reading would be quite casual, and I would not like to predicate an argument upon it. I suppose a great deal of evidence was taken, and I presume it will be printed before we proceed much further with the bill. A few days ago we were discussing the Bank Act, and the evidence was printed daily. The Bank Act was a fairly simple subject. It might be discussed in a young ladies' seminary or a kindergarten school with great ease and be made plain to everybody. I do not mean to say that banking itself or finance generally is an easy subject; but when you are dealing with a concrete question such as the Bank Act, it is quite easy.

Mr. SALES: Has the hon. member seen to-night's paper with the report of the Union Bank in it?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes. I do not know what my hon. friend wants to draw from that.

Mr. SALES: Is it a very simple matter?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think it is anything that will reflect upon the actions of the majority of the committee. It might cause some misgivings on the part of some other hon. gentlemen, including, perhaps, my hon. friend. The point I want to make is this: Last night I heard for, I suppose, the hundredth time, that it was unfair and unjust to proceed to the consideration of a measure which had been before a committee for two months, until the people had had an opportunity of reading and studying the evidence. The evidence in that case had been printed daily, and it was before the country and parliament. I want to suggest to the minister that he is going to meet with tremendous opposition from our hon. friends directly opposite, because I am sure they will not consent to a favourable consideration of the bill until the evidence is printed, so that they may know what they are doing.

Mr. HOEY: How long is it since the report of the commission was tabled?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is the report of a commission, a report made by three men who are not infallible.

Mr. HOEY: Were the members of the Banking committee infallible?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not allege that at all. I merely mean to say—and I am sure everybody opposite to me will agree and they must say that later this evening—that it would be unfair and unjust to proceed further in this matter until the evidence is printed, so that we may know what we are doing and whatever course we shall take—

Mr. HOEY: They will have stolen another crop if we wait that length of time.

Mr. GARDINER: I might suggest that we put them in gaol first, and then wait for the evidence.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is the hon. member aware that the fact of a combination between the shipping companies was proved and is within the knowledge of the House now?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not quite understand my hon. friend's question.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Perhaps the hon. member does not wish to answer.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I thought it was a good opportunity to remind my hon. friends right opposite me that this might be a good chance to be consistent upon such an important question.

Mr. SHAW: Do I understand that my hon. friend now adopts the arguments that were propounded from this side of the House yesterday?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No. I do not go even so far as to say that I would personally demand the printing of the evidence. I am simply advising the minister that he must expect most powerful opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite to this bill being pro-

ceeded with further until the evidence is printed, so that they may know what they are doing.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member for Halifax thinks misery likes company. He would like to see the minister in the same box.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The subject involved in this resolution has been before this House on many occasions in the past. I was always opposed to it and I think the majority of members of parliament were usually opposed to it. I shall still be opposed to the principle involved in this resolution, unless I hear some stronger reasons to the contrary from some hon. gentlemen who may yet speak. I refer to the motions that were made annually by Mr. Armstrong, one of the members from Ontario, motions which practically covered the same ground as this resolution purports to cover. In so far as the bill proposes taking powers to suspend the coasting laws, I do not object to it. Perhaps that is a fair power for the Governor in Council to have for many reasons, and in view of the report of the commission, I do not complain that that power is proposed to be taken by the minister. If there was a combine, and if there was exacted excessively high, unconscionable rates, it is our duty, by amending the general law, the Combines Act, to meet that case. That surely is a fair proposition; and if it is possible to meet that particular situation, then I say it should be met by an amendment to the general law. I object to paternal legislation and to all efforts to meet by means of specific enactments every little grievance.

I should not like my hon. friend to go the length of adopting the laissez faire policy of the Manchester School of economists. I remember that when I first learned that Bright and Cobden had opposed some labour legislation which seemed obviously defensible I was astounded. I do admit that, as we progress, special legislation must be introduced to meet special conditions of the day; but I do not think that this is a case in which we should adopt the legislation proposed in the resolution. The resolution proposes to control prices. Now freight is a commodity like anything else, and I do not know of any case where prices have been successfully controlled. It is possible that during the war many countries successfully exercised some control over prices in different directions.

Mr. KNOX: Does the hon. gentleman not think that there is some comparison between this question and the Railway Commission?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No; I shall come to that later. I was observing that during the war, when imports and exports were controlled, a control of prices was possible and perhaps successful, although since then economists who have studied the question have declared that price control was unsuccessful and disastrous. I was reading only yesterday a book by an eminent European economist who, discussing this very matter, contends that during the war high prices were due not to the exactions of middlemen, or of trusts, or of any combinations of that character, but to great inflation of credit, which produced competition for the world's output. I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) and one of the hon. members for Calgary would agree with that view; the rise of prices was due to that cause rather than to any great profits exacted by producers and sellers. I admit, of course, that in many cases there was profiteering of a very objectionable nature.

Mr. MILLAR: If the hon. member has read the report carefully he will find that the commissioners state that the rates on all commodities on the lakes except grain are controlled in one way or another. By a contractual arrangement the rates on ore, which is one of the largest cargoes carried, and on coal as well, are controlled. The commissioners declare that everything is controlled except grain.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not contending that there was not a combination and that, perhaps, some remedial legislation is not necessary. I am simply arguing that the proposal contained in the resolution does not provide the proper procedure. Some hon. gentlemen asked me a few moments ago whether, if it was fair to control railway rates, it was not equally fair to control shipping rates. I say there is no analogy whatever between the two cases. The railways constitute a monopoly in this country, as in all countries. The construction of railways must of necessity be limited, so that in all respects railways are a monopoly that should be controlled. No person or corporation is permitted to build railways in this country in competition with existing lines without statutory authority because it is not deemed prudent to allow people to build such railways everywhere they please; it is not considered in the national interests. On the contrary, it is considered wise from the national point of view to select the corporations who shall be allowed to build and operate railways. So that with deliberation the state constitutes a monopoly in this regard. In shipping, the analogous case would consist in confining steamship operations

on the Great Lakes to one or two or three lines and then controlling rates. That would be analogous to the railway situation, and the control of rates in that case might be justifiable. Still no one would support that view. Again I doubt whether this parliament has the jurisdiction to enact the legislation proposed in the resolution. I do not believe there is one single proposal in the resolution that ultimately will be held to be within the legislative powers of this parliament. More than that, I doubt very much the wisdom—

Mr. CARROLL: Would the hon. gentleman specify his reasons for doubting parliament's jurisdiction?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): As I say, I doubt very much the wisdom, if there is any doubt about the jurisdiction, of enacting this legislation. We do not want to go through the same experience we had in connection with the Board of Commerce. I am not going to give my reasons for my doubts as to the competency of this parliament to pass this legislation. The opinion of the law officers of the Crown should be made known to parliament and whatever it is it will be acceptable to me.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) approved of it

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I really do not know that he has.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Well, he has through his government.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): For that matter legislation is frequently presented to parliament by governments without any special attention having been given to the question of jurisdiction or constitutionality

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Then he is not competent to be Minister of Justice.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Whenever the question is raised I think it will be the duty of the Department of Justice to give it consideration and advise parliament in the premises. Now, if it is fair to introduce this legislation in respect of shipping on the Great Lakes, someone will come along and say that the same thing should be done on the Pacific coast or on the Atlantic. We have free trade in shipping.

Mr. GOOD: No, we have not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, subject to the alleged combination; it is qualified of course, to that extent. But there is nothing to prohibit anybody going into the lake freight business.

Mr. FORKE: When you recollect that there are six strong companies doing business on the lakes, is it possible for a single competitor to do business against that combination?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Such competition might be difficult. But what would happen if this legislation had the effect of decreasing that number? I do not say that this will happen, but I simply put the question to my hon. friend. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, who stand as exponents of legislation which permits an equal opportunity to all; and if those hon. gentlemen take the same point of view as they take in connection with analogous matters, then I am sure they will be opposed to this legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I doubt the power of parliament to legislate. In the second place, if this measure is put on the statute book I say it will be ineffective. It is an attempt to control prices, and this is always ineffectual. It is unsound, and I do not believe that hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of the resolution believe in the control of prices. It never gets you anywhere; it hurts everybody and accomplishes no good results.

Mr. KNOX: Does the hon. member believe in this scale of rates last season running from three to eleven cents?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not discussing rates at all. Let me repeat, if the rates charged were so excessive as to become what we might term unconscionable, and we think that something should be done to prevent a recurrence, let us amend the Anti-Combines Act or pass general legislation which will be applicable to the whole country.

Mr. HOEY: Will the minister tell us if the government have consulted the law officers of the Crown with regard to their power under the Criminal Code to prosecute the men who constituted this combine? I understood that during the investigation two or three of these—I hesitate to call them what their conduct merits; I certainly would not call them Canadians—were down at Palm Beach. But it is altogether likely that they have since returned to Canada. Numerous representations have been made to me on the subject and I am convinced that western Canada in its present mood is going to demand the prosecution of these men. Before I leave the Chamber to-night I should like to know if the government have consulted the law officers of the Crown with regard to their

power to proceed under the Criminal Code. If not, what justification has the minister to give to the House?

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I imagine my hon. friend has in mind a prosecution under the Criminal Code. I am not a legal man, but I would advise my hon. friend that if any one in western Canada desires to prosecute the persons referred to, the Criminal Code is open to him as to anyone else. In reply to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) I gather he is in favour of the legislation proposed in the next resolution for the suspension of the coasting laws, but that he objects to the government gathering the very information necessary before we can intelligently decide whether or not we should suspend those laws.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not object to the proposal to suspend the coasting laws, because there seems to be a general demand for such suspension and many people think it might prevent a repetition of what occurred last year. I do not believe in it as a matter of principle, but I conceive it may be necessary at the present time.

Mr. ROBB: But the government before deciding whether suspension is necessary or not must have certain information. This bill will empower the Board of Grain Commissioners to gather such information from time to time. This should satisfy my hon. friend that part of the legislation at least is necessary. My hon. friend doubts the legality of this proposed legislation. I am bound to admit that it may be challenged before the courts and declared illegal. The Grain Act was taken into the courts, but the gentlemen who did so are sorry to-day because they have cast some doubt upon that legislation. It is always possible to destroy the usefulness of measures which are enacted for the good of the people generally, for there are always clever lawyers ready to plead their clients' case. I am not prepared to say whether some one might not successfully contest the validity of this bill after its enactment, but it has been prepared by the law officers of the Crown, and the government believe in its legality.

Mr. FORKE: Would the minister state upon what advice the Governor in Council would be prepared to act in suspending the coasting laws?

Mr. ROBB: That would be determined later after the necessary information was secured. Last year the government received telephone messages urging the suspension of the coasting laws. We replied that we must have something in writing, and eventually we received telegrams. But other gentlemen telegraphed the government that it was not necessary to suspend the coasting laws. This shows the necessity of some machinery for gathering the information we require before we can act intelligently, and what better machinery can we have for this purpose than the Board of Grain Commissioners who understand the necessities of the grain trade?

Mr. FORKE: That is all right.

Mr. SALES: I have followed with interest the ingenious arguments of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean)—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): They were not ingenious at all.

Mr. SALES:—in his attempt to convince us that we should vote against this bill. As usual, he tendered us his sympathy. We have had a good deal of sympathy already and will have a lot of it to take back to our people in the West. Of course, it is a very cheap commodity. But I can assure him that he will not find any objection to this bill from this quarter of the House unless I am very much mistaken. His whole argument is against the fixing of the lake rates. I would reply, Mr. Chairman, that it all depends on who does the fixing. These rates have been fixed a long, long time for us—but not by us. Yesterday the fixing of the bank interest rate was objected to. It has been fixed a good long time. I want to know, Mr. Chairman, why the lake rates should not be controlled. Here we have a magnificent waterway, we have spent millions of dollars on it and we are still spending many more millions. And the people who settled in the West have always hoped that this waterway would be used to convey their grain at very cheap rates. We have been told time and again—by our friends on the right especially, who are so strong in advocating the St. Lawrence route—that the opening of this route will mean a saving of at least five cents a bushel to the farmer on his grain. I have never believed it because experience has shown that the more money we spend on these waterways the higher the rates go. I wonder how the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) would explain this situation—that Canadian boats carry grain from American ports at rates 50 per cent cheaper than from Canadian ports. We find many instances of this discrimination in the evidence taken before the special commission. Here are a few of them: Fort William to Port Colborne, 3¾ cents; Duluth to Port Colborne, 2¼ cents. These

rates were in effect the same day for practically the same distance—perhaps a little farther from Duluth. Fort William to Port McNicoll, 3 cents; Chicago to Depot Harbour, 2 cents. And so on all the way down the line. The finding of the commission is that the rates are practically 50 per cent higher from Canadian ports than from American. How would my hon. friend justify that? Does he wonder that we think some sort of control is necessary? My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) argued that the producer pays the bill. He certainly does. When the exporter finds it is costing him so much to ship his grain, he makes his bid on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in accordance with that cost, and the price for the day is communicated to the elevators in the country, thus affecting the farmers' price.

11 p.m.

With regard to the situation last fall I know that representations were made to the minister to put into effect the suspension of the coasting laws. They were asking a price for May even during the winter which affected every bushel of wheat marketed in the West during all the winter months. But no action was taken by the government until late last fall when boats were used for winter storage. As to the legality, I would point out that such action was taken years ago by the then existing Conservative government by order in council, and its action was never challenged at all.

I was very greatly disappointed with the answer given by the minister that no action would be taken against these men who had been found guilty of fleecing the western producer of millions of dollars. I was very greatly disappointed with his reply that it is open to anybody in the West to prosecute these men. To my mind that is not a satisfactory situation at all, and if this government has the interests of the producer at heart they should if at all possible take action against these men. There is sufficient evidence I think to prove that a combine in restraint of trade existed not only in regard to rates but also in regard to insurance.

Mr. ROBB: I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend's argument, but may I remind him that the administration of the criminal law is left entirely to the provinces.

Mr. SALES: Then will the minister explain to the committee how he expects to get action under the new anti-Combines Act?

Mr. DUFF: The provinces will have to prosecute.

Mr. SALES: I did not understand it that way. I thought when we passed this legislation it had teeth in it and that this government would be able to take action.

An hon. MEMBER: Sold again.

Mr. SALES: Sold again as my hon. friend says, I believe is correct.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Just in order to make that point clear, under the British North America Act the administration of the criminal law and its enforcement rests with the Attorney General of any province where the offence is committed, and if there was a combine in regard to rates formed in Winnipeg last year constituting an offence under the Criminal Code, the Attorney General of Manitoba would be the person who should prosecute. The anti-Combines Act passed this session provides for investigation and lays down how all proceedings may be taken under it, and so far as any of its provisions relate to this government they will be carried out.

Mr. FORKE: This combination was formed in Toronto, Chicago and Winnipeg.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That just illustrates the difficulty, which I am sure my hon friend will appreciate, of this government undertaking to legislate in regard to matters that affect not only Canada but the United States.

Mr. FORKE: But the offence was committed in Canada.

Mr. SALES: May I ask for information how you would deal with a combine that was shipping grain from Fort William to Montreal, operating in two provinces, Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Wherever the combine is formed, if it is a criminal offence the law would be enforced by the Attorney General of the province.

Mr. SALES: Supposing as they did in this case, that they move from Toronto to New York, and that we found in conference not only representatives of the shipping companies but representatives of the government owned lines. It was brought out in evidence that the representatives of the government line attended those meetings with Mr. Wolvin, Mr. Enderby of the Canada Steamship Lines, and Mr. Matthews of the Matthews Line. Will that combine be considered to have been formed in New York and therefore be regarded as outside the jurisdiction of this country?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is confusing the question of the administration of the Criminal Code with the carrying into effect of the provisions of the anti-Combines Act. The anti-Combines Act that passed this House would not have any effect as regards a combine formed last summer unless it is in existence now. No act is retroactive unless it is specially declared to be so. My hon. friend is familiar with the provisions of the anti-Combines Act, and so far as its provisions relate to this government they will be carried out, but the administration of the Criminal Code rests with the province where the offence is committed.

Mr. SALES: I was simply taking my hon. friend's statement that the party who should prosecute would be the Attorney General of the province where the offence was committed, and I went on to say that this combine was formed in New York, and wanted to know whether the Criminal Code could be applied in that case, or would it be considered as being outside the jurisdiction of this country?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend had better ask the hon. member for Calgary West, who I understand supplies the law for that side of the House on legal questions.

Mr. SALES: Why should I be given an answer like that when the Minister of Justice is sitting in his seat? If the disposition of the government is to pass us by with answers such as was given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the one that is now given by the Acting Minister of National Defence, what is the use of our trying to get information? If the Minister of Justice would care to give the information I should be very pleased to receive it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If the hon. member will be good enough to put his question I will try and answer it. What is the question please?

Mr. SALES: The question is this: Three of these shipping men who practically control the whole shipping on the Great Lakes so far as Canada is concerned meet in New York with representatives of our government-owned lines and make a combine to fix rates. Now would action against that combine be considered to be outside the jurisdiction of this country?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I would prefer to have a little time to consider the question, but answering offhand I would be inclined to say that this would not constitute a combine on which prosecution could be instituted in this country.

Mr. SALES: I do not intend to take up any more time at this stage. Anything I have to say on the insurance and brokerage clauses I will say when they come up.

Mr. CARROLL: This question of shipping on the Great Lakes is rather an old one. For twenty years or more the shipping interests of the United States have been endeavouring to gain a foothold in what we might call local Canadian shipping. I have been told that some ten or twelve years ago the government, which at that time owned the elevators at Montreal, offered to certain men who were prepared to put up a certain amount of capital for shipping on the Great Lakes the use of the elevators at Montreal without cost providing that they would ship through these elevators five million bushels of wheat. While we may talk about combines, the fact is that certain men in this country made a proposition that they would put their money into a shipping enterprise which would carry wheat and other commodities from the head of the lakes to Montreal. In those days it was a marvellous thing to think that at any time in the future 5,000,000 bushels of wheat might be shipped to the grain elevators of Montreal. So huge an enterprise did it appear that the gentlemen who had the proposition in hand refused to give any undertaking in the matter. But what do we find to-day? Instead of 5,000,000 bushels of wheat, over 150,000,000 bushels last year went through the elevators of Montreal I believe, that a development of such a character is in the interest of Canadian shipping and of Canadian business. My hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Sales), I think it was, said that we had little sympathy with certain propositions which he had to make. Well, personally, as a general rule I am more or less in sympathy with propositions intended to benefit Canadian industry and the Canadian people; but I do not believe we should consider a proposition which will place Canadian shipping on the Great Lakes in the hands of American companies, as will be the case if this bill becomes law. May I say that I have been reading American papers for some days past, ever since the announcement of this proposed legislation was made, and it is a marvellous thing to consider that within twenty-four hours from the time it became known an American company was formed at Duluth for the purpose of interfering—shall I say?—with Canadian and American trade—

Mr. McMURRAY: Competing would be better.

Mr CARROLL: No I say interfering; it is not a case of competing. I will answer my hon. friend by saying this: If our government had made certain propositions whereby our Canadian coasting vessels on the Great Lakes would be given the same rights in the United States as this bill proposes to give American shipping in Canada, I would say it was a fair proposition.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have got that provision in our law.

Mr. CARROLL: I should like to see it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to be found in section 958 of the Shipping Act which provides that:

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this part shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place to another in such country.

So we already have this provision in our law.

Mr. CARROLL: Has the minister had any undertaking on behalf of the American government that the thing will be made effective? Certainly not, but we are giving away certain rights that we have on the Great Lakes which I think we should hold dear and sacred. While I do not wish to oppose a government measure I consider the time has come when we as Canadians should uphold our rights and privileges, and treat as they deserve any company or any combine who may propose to take away from us those trading rights which American companies will enjoy if this bill goes into effect.

My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) made some observations as to the constitutionality of this question. Well, I think he is right. However, I am not going into that question at all. I say we have developed a trade on the Great Lakes which we are foolish to abandon to competitors in the United States.

Mr. BANCROFT: Whom does my hon. friend mean by "we?"

Mr. CARROLL: I mean we Canadians. Perhaps my hon. friend does not belong to that class; I am afraid he does not. I mean that we Canadians have developed a trade on the Great Lakes which we should preserve to the utmost of our ability. My hon. friend asks "Who are we?" Propositions were made years ago, as I have already said, to various shipping interests to g\ into this business and attempt to draw the \rain trade from Fort William and the various lake ports to Montreal. They have done that successfully but I do say this: If they have combined to charge unjustifiable freight rates on the upper lakes they should be brought to task; but it is unfair, and the argument cannot be justified, to maintain that we should throw open our ports to American interests, and permit them to divert our grain trade from Montreal or Quebec to United States ports. I am that kind of an American—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARROLL: Or I should say rather that kind of Canadian.

Mr. MILLAR: Is my hon. friend aware that the amount of grain going through American ports has increased steadily during the last three or four years, and that at the present time the Canadian boats are giving the preference to Buffalo—that is carrying grain much cheaper to Buffalo than to Canadian ports?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not aware of that.

Mr. MILLAR: It is a fact all the same.

Mr. CARROLL: I am aware of this fact—that twelve years ago we were shipping 5,000,000 bushels a week to the ports of Montreal and Quebec and to-day we are shipping 150,000,000 bushels to those same ports.

Mr. MILLAR: I rather think you must be wrong in your dates.

Mr. CARROLL: Then let my hon. friend correct me.

Mr. MILLAR: The port of Montreal was under the Harbour Commission more than twelve years ago.

Mr. CARROLL: Perhaps I should say thirteen years ago. I obtained authoritative figures from the Department of Trade and Commerce and Marine and Fisheries.

There is another aspect of this question I would like to discuss very briefly. A commission investigated the freight rates on the Great Lakes, and I have no hesitation in saying that the three gentlemen that composed it were three very excellent men. But I would suggest to you, Sir, that if, when this government appointed a commission to investigate the operations of the Pension Act, they had selected as commissioners a farmer, a blacksmith or a lawyer there would have been a great outcry against the proceeding.

And why? Because those men would not know anything about the question of pensions.

An hon. MEMBER: What about a lawyer?

Mr. CARROLL: A lawyer would not know very much about the pension question unless he was directly connected with the Pension Board or acted in some similar capacity. What do we find here? We appoint a commission. I ask hon. members: Who were on that commission who knew anything about rates on the Great Lakes or elsewhere? They make a report. Are we bound to accept a report which comes from people who know as little about freight rates on the Great Lakes or elsewhere in Canada as I do? I know nothing about it. This is a proposition which should be carefully considered.

Mr. MILLAR: May I point out that Mr. Symington of Winnipeg who is perhaps one of the greatest rate experts in Canada was solicitor for this commission.

Mr. CARROLL: He may have been a fine solicitor. I understand he was not a member of this board. He may have been a solicitor for the board—I do not know. Can the hon. member tell me who was connected with that board who knows anything about shipping rates or transportation?

Mr. MILLAR: I have pleasure in answering the question. I am not personally ecquainted with Mr. McLean who was chairman of the commission but I have read in the papers that he was a very great expert on this matter.

Mr. CARROLL: Who told the hon. member that Mr. McLean was an expert on any question of freight rates? He never had any experience in the world. Mr. Thomson, who was a member of this House at one time, a very estimable gentleman, was on the board.

Mr. FORKE: Does the hon. member see the position he is putting the government in just now?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not particular about it.

Mr. HANSON: Why should the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) be worried about it? He is altogether too anxious about the government.

Mr. FORKE: It really seems a very strange position that we from this side of the House should be defending the actions of the government, while a member from the other side of the House is condemning the government; but I am not worried.

Mr. CARROLL: I am not worrying, my conscience is clear.

Mr. FORKE: A member on the Conservative side is worrying.

Mr. HANSON: I am pointing out the incongruity of it.

Mr. FORKE: I think the hon. member is lacking in a sense of humour.

Mr. CARROLL: I appreciate what the leader of the Progressives has said; but I am as independent as he is, when it comes to a question whether I should take a certain stand. I cannot agree with my hon. friend for South York (Mr. Maclean) because his anxiety is shown in this particular connection.

Mr. BANCROFT: The member for South York was anxious yesterday.

Mr. CARROLL: But my hon. friend the leader of the Progressives must not forget that we on this side of the House are not bound down. We are not slaves to any policy the government may bring down. On this side of the House we sometimes use our common sense and judgment; and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that our judgment is generally correct. If the leader of the Progressives were following this government, he would sit down in a servile manner and support any proposition they might introduce. I think that is his position to-night. But if there is a proposition brought forth which I consider to be unfavourable to Canadian interests, un-Canadian in the extreme, I will oppose it. I did not read very extensively the report of this commission, but I would just as soon take the report of three seamen on grain or freight rates as I would accept the proposition which has been placed before us by this commission. I take the stand—and my friends on the government benches do not like my proposition very much—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Go right ahead.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not think they are paying much attention to it.

Mr. CARROLL: My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has taken the course which perhaps lets him out rather easily—a constitutional course. I would rather suggest to my hon. friend from Halifax that he should take the common sense of this thing, and let the constitutional aspect be governed more or less by the Minister of Justice, who is always ready and willing to give an opinion, and I think any decision coming from his department is right.

I would ask the government to take into consideration, quietly, calmly and deliberately, the proposition as to whether or not we are going to destroy a Canadian industry which has taken some 15 years to build up, in favour of American industries, and American companies, which to-day are being organized in the various states along the Great Lakes, to the detriment of our Canadian trade. I would think, although not having given very serious thought to the question, that there must be some way of dealing with exorbitant rates on the Great Lakes without throwing into the hands of a foreign government the shipping interests on those lakes. We might have another commission, for example, composed of a fisherman, a blacksmith and a banker, who know nothing about shipping interests on the Great Lakes, who would advise the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to how he could control those rates. I do not think any person can see that I am very antagonistic towards the government, but I for one, as a Canadian, do not like the proposition to throw open an industry which has taken twenty years to establish, which has in a few years increased our grain exports from Montreal from 5,000,000 bushels to 150,000,000 bushels. I do not think we should rush in and give those interests which were opposing us the right to interfere with our lake freight rates, unless we get the same treatment from the United States.

Mr. ROBB: I did not wish to interrupt my hon. friend in his speech, because I noticed that he has given careful consideration to this subject; but apparently he was under a misapprehension and thought that it was another resolution that was under consideration. The resolution now before the House has nothing whatever to do, more than the gathering of information, with the suspension of the coasting laws. The objections of my hon. friend would come quite correctly in the consideration of the next bill to be placed before the House. All we are doing now is to provide publicity; so that the shipper will be compelled to publish his rates, and to publish the space available; If the Board of Grain Commissioners so determine, they may fix a maximum rate. I will not follow this any further than to make this statement. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) referred to the enormouse increase in the export of grain through the port of Montreal, and he objected very strenuously to Canada permitting American ships to come into our waters. May I say right now that most of the grain going through the port of Montreal comes in now on American ships?

Mr. CALDWELL: American grain.

Mr. ROBB: This does no injury to Canadian trade. It gives labour to Canadian citizens; it makes revenue for Canadian merchants and shippers, and incidentally the taxes come back in a degree to the government.

Mr. CARROLL: Is that coast-wise trade?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. CARROLL: Certainly not.

Mr. ROBB: A few days ago when we had under consideration something regarding shipping, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) questioned my statement and asserted that no grain went through the Quebec elevator last year.

Mr. MILLAR: No. The statement I made was that last year no boats carrying export grain were diverted from Montreal to Quebec.

Mr. ROBB: As I think Hansard will show, and as my recollection goes, my hon. friend stated that no grain or very little was put through that elevator. I will, however, accept my hon. friend's correction. Last year there was put through the port of Montreal 147,564,328 bushels, and of that quantity, 83,944,389 bushels consisted of United States grain, as against 63,000,000 bushels Canadian grain, or about 20,000,000 bushels less Canadian grain than American grain were put through the port of Montreal. Through the port of Quebec we put a total of 5,968,765 bushels last year. My hon. friend who represents that city in this House, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) tells me that already in the first month of navigation, the elevator at Quebec has put through something over a million bushels. We have had a very reasonable discussion upon this resolution. We have in some regards got away from it—

Mr. CAMPBELL: Did the grain that went through the port of Quebec come in by boat or rail?

Mr. ROBB: I have not the information for last year, but I gather that part of it must have gone in by boat. This year it is going in by boat. Last year there were 13,000,000 bushels of United States corn, and corn is always largely shipped to this country by water. This is a better route for corn than the southern route. The corn cools off with the transshipment, and it carries better.

I was proceeding to say that we have had a reasonable discussion upon the resolution, and the bill will come along to-morrow. It is getting late, and while I do not want to stop any further discussion, I would ask that

if hon. members discuss this resolution, they keep to the question of the resolution, and we will take up the coasting laws later on.

Mr. McBRIDE: I should like to say just a word in connection with this resolution. A couple of hon. members asked a question why grain was carried from Canadian ports into American ports more cheaply than it was between two Canadian ports. While I am frank to admit that I know nothing about shipping regulations on the Great Lakes, I know a little about them in Vancouver. I may say that I was interested in some trading steamers on the Pacific coast, and we always gave a better rate into an American port than we did from one Canadian port to another. I will tell you the reason why. We could go into Seattle, for instance, at 6 o'clock in the evening, and we could get discharged and leave at 6 o'clock the next morning We could never get that in a Canadian port. If we went into Victoria at 6 o'clock in the evening, we would have to wait until 8 o'clock the next morning before we started to unload. Time counts, more particularly when you are paying your crews and other expenses. We gave a better rate and we made money by doing so.

A good deal has been said on this side of the House in connection with freight rates I understand that six of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are on the Great Lakes, and I am going to put up a suggestion to the government, namely that this government give the grain commissioners a charter of those six steamers for a dollar each per annum; that they operate them, and that the profit they make on those steamers for the season control the rate that is charged on the Great Lakes, they to put their own crews and their own captains on the ships, and be responsible for the ships. All the government should ask them to do is to pay a dollar each and to cover them with insurance.

Mr. DUFF: The rates will be twice as high as they are now.

Mr. McBRIDE: I think the people on the lakes would be perfectly satisfied with the rates that this would establish.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like to make a reference or two to some statements that have been made this evening. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) seems to question the ability of the commissioners to examine into this question. While, perhaps, it is the prerogative of the government to defend those men, I submit that it is impossible to get men of the same profession or of the same class to examine into a business of this kind. According to the hon. member for South Cape Breton, it would be necessary to have grain shippers themselves examine into this matter. Could we get a fair decision from men engaged in grain shipping? According to his argument, if you had a liquor case to investigate, the prosecution would have to have a bootlegger to conduct the investigation. That is the sum and substance of his argument.

As regards the remarks made by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) I think he has not read very carefully the report of the commission, because it conclusively proves that unloading conditions and conditions with regard to return cargoes and everything else were just as favourable at Canadian ports as they were at American ports. The commissioners point that out most conclusively, and state that there was no particular reason whatever for the discrimination. I should like to make just one reference in this respect. They refer particularly to the Standard Shipping Company, which charters or controls, and still does to-day, 54 per cent of the Canadian space on the Great Lakes, and which controls 27 per cent on the American lakes. They make this reference:

> It seems clear that competition on the Canadian side is not nearly so keen as on the American side. In fact, among Winnipeg brokers—

That is those who are handling or who have control of all the space on the lakes.

—it is almost non-existent.

Mr. SALES: In order to correct the misapprehensions of the hon member for Cariboo who spoke of unloading from a Canadian port into an American port, I may say that this is not the case at all. I am going to quote just four examples:

August 31, Duluth to Port Colborne, 2¼ cents.
Fort William to Port Colborne, 3¾ cents.
August 4, Chicago to Port Colborne, 2 cents.
Fort William to Port Colborne, 3¾ cents.
July 31, Chicago to Port McNicoll, 2 cents.
Fort William to Port McNicoll, 3 cents.
August 4, Chicago to Port McNicoll, 2 cents.
Fort William to Port McNicoll, 3 cents.

These are all unloaded in a Canadian port. The argument advanced by my hon. friend does not apply. May I ask the minister when we may expect to have the bill, so that we may study it?

Mr. ROBB: That will depend on when the argument is through. If my hon. friend is going to talk all night—

Mr. SALES: It is through so far as I am concerned, if the minister will give me the information.

Mr. ROBB: I can give my hon. friend no information until the resolution is passed

Then I shall be prepared to give him the information immediately.

Mr. GOULD: The minister stated that the bill will compel shippers to show the rates, amount of space available, and so on. According to the evidence adduced before the commission, and as I think myself, that would tend to give these men an opportunity of submitting to the government statements similar to those which they have placed before the commission,—statements advancing their own point of view but entirely out of keeping with the facts as they were proved to exist. These men have deceived us twice: they deceived us when they erected this combine on the lakes, and they deceived, or at least attempted to deceive, the commission which the government appointed to investigate their activities. This notwithstanding, however, the government proposes now to accept their word again in regard to the advertising of rates, and so forth. I am not in the mood now to tolerate that. They burnt us twice, and I think we should be careful now. There is particular mention in the introduction of the reasons that impelled the government to institute a commission to investigate the whole matter, as it applies to western Canada. I am pleased to note that special reference is made to that part of the country, because we feel that we have been oppressed time and time again. We do not want to rehearse the various ways in which we have been harassed, and our products practically stolen from us, but we undoubtedly want the government to do something by way of legislation to prevent these people from taking an unfair advantage of us again. An exhibition should be made of some of these men instead of their word being taken again after they have deceived the community as they have done. Does the minister not think that we have a right to demand other tribunals to show to the government what the facts and the conditions warrant in the way of rates?

Mr. McBRIDE: Would the hon. member be in favour of the Grain Commission taking over the six steamers the government has on the lakes?

Mr. ROBB: I am reminded that a few moments ago the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) thought that he was rising to the defence of the government. If this legislation is not satisfactory to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) then he might offer some suggestions as to how it can be improved. When we get into committee he can submit those suggestions; but if hon. gentlemen are disposed to delay the legislation, if they do not want to let it go through, I do not see why we should press it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 235 with respect to Freight Rates for the Carriage of Grain by Lake and River Navigation.

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

Mr. ROBB: I hope to proceed with the bill either to-morrow or Monday.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

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

Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal section 958 of the Canada Shipping Act, as enacted by chapter sixty-four of the statutes of 1908, and to enact in lieu thereof that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, by order in council declare that the foregoing provisions of this part shall not, for the period specified in such order in council, apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified, ascertained or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels, of any foreign country.

Mr. DUFF: Is it the purpose of the government to suspend the laws in regard to American ships if the American government does not suspend its laws so far as Canadian ships are concerned?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Under the law as it is we have the power to suspend the coastal laws as they affect a foreign country if that country is willing to reciprocate. We are seeking to change the law to give the Governor in Council power in any emergency, if the necessity arises, to suspend the coastal laws for a time in any particular district or in regard to certain vessels. Of course, this power will be exercised with discretion and will be invoked only when it is absolutely necessary. I think we may safely trust the government not to injure Canadian shipping. What we propose to do is intended not for the benefit of American shipping but in the interests of the Dominion, and will be resorted to only to serve that end.

Mr. STEVENS: Under what power were the coastal laws suspended last fall, and also by a previous government a few years ago?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I really am not in a position to answer that question. Under the law as it stands there is certainly nothing to entitle the government to suspend the coastal laws. I understand that in 1913 they were suspended, but only by virtue of an agreement with the companies themselves who submitted without questioning the legality or otherwise of the action. Last year I believe they were suspended only for one or two trips of the season. The government undoubtedly took a chance, because under the law as it stands they have no power in the matter.

Mr. FORKE: I would point out to the minister that when the coasting laws were suspended the suspension was a dead letter. The chances were that if any ships went into the Bay ports at that time they would never get out again.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 236 to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

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

Mr. LAPOINTE: If there is no objection I shall be willing to proceed now.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent—

Mr. SALES: Next sitting.

Mr. SHAW: Next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): I understand that the bill to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act has been distributed. If the House is willing, we might consider this bill now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: When this bill was called this afternoon its consideration was fixed for the next sitting, and unless the House agrees to revert to that order the bill cannot be considered to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Sir LOMER GOUIN moved that the House go into committee on Bill No. 232 to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

[Mr. Stevens.]

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

On clause 1—Sessional allowance.

Mr. BOIVIN: Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that after discussing this clause with a certain number of hon. members of the opposition and ministers of the Crown it has been decided to amend it to meet the objection which was made the other day upon the motion for concurrence in the report of the committee, by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) . He pointed out that if a session of fifty days or more did not exceed sixty-five days, some hon. members might receive a full sessional indemnity, whereas other hon. members who were unavoidably absent for only a few days would only be paid at the rate of $25 per day. There is a general desire to meet any legitimate objection and I therefore move to substitute for the word "fifty' in the second line of section 32, the word "sixty-five."

Amendment agreed to.

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, all last session and this session we have heard economy preached in this House not only by one particular group but by all groups. Unfortunately no economy can be practised without hurting somebody; it must stop works which would give employment to people, or less wages must be paid. Yet it would seem that at the rate at which expenditures are increasing and the earning power of a great portion of the people decreasing, something will have to be done in the way of rigid and painful economy. I believe that economy, like charity, should begin at home. Possibly it would hurt the other fellow less, he who has been practising economy until it does hurt, if we here practised a little economy of our own. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on May 23, 1922, said:

> I must to-day present two thoughts which ares of paramount importance. The first is as to the need, the deep and earnest need, of economy. That means that we must appeal both to members of parliament and to the people to pass what I may call self-denying ordinances.

I believe that when the indemnity was increased in 1920 the chief argument in its favour was that the price of everything had gone up. If that argument was good then, it is surely true that the opposite argument is good now, because the cost of living is surely, if slowly, becoming less. Farm products have almost lost their value. I have heard members in this House admit that last

year they took part of their indemnity to make up the deficiency on their farms. That makes me wonder how the man is getting along who has a farm but no indemnity.

I intend to move an amendment to this clause which will ask members to place upon themselves a self-denying ordinance. If we do this we shall then have much more weight in explaining to our constituents that it is bad policy to ask for what might be called "grab" improvements for any particular constituency. There is no need to dwell upon the severe economic depression through which we are passing. Some believe that we are through the worst of it, and I hope they are right, but at least it can be said that Ontario agriculturists to-day are suffering more acutely than for many years past. I am led to move this amendment because I know a great many people have been forced this year to do without telephones and daily papers, not because they are luxuries, but because they must do without something in order to make their income and their expenses meet.

The real reason however, that I am anxious to amend this clause is that those who are suffering because of the rigid economy which they must practise would be helped in spirit by us here passing upon ourselves a self-denying ordinance. Of late years the impression has gone abroad that members of parliament are more concerned about themselves—which would include their pay—than about anyone else. This is not a desirable condition, and possibly if at great suffering to ourselves we decreased our pay, ultimately this suspicion would be removed and our self-denial would really do a great deal towards putting heart into the people who to-day are suffering.

Now possibly it will be said, or at least it will be thought by a great many members that it is expensive to be a member of parliament, that we are supposed to give to all charitable and all sporting and all literary needs in our constituencies. My own opinion is that generous giving to many things in a constituency is a subtle way of buying popularity. I do not mean by that that we should be robbed of the privilege as individuals of giving where we think we should, but this wholesale sort of giving that one associates with politics and politicians is, I am convinced, bad for the giver and bad for the receiver of the gift. That is one thing on which I took a rigid stand during my campaign. I carefully explained that I would not give to people who came begging for gifts, and I have lived up to that, with I believe no disastrous results either to myself or those asking for the gifts. It is true that a member of parliament between sessions because of an awakened and interested electorate works much more strenuously now than in days gone by. I think that sort of thing should be increased and encouraged. I for one intend to cover thoroughly as I did last recess my riding, but I do not think the cut which I shall ask at the conclusion of this speech will prevent any member so inclined from meeting his electorate.

I believe that another one of the chief pleas that was put up by the members of the government of 1920 when this increase was made was that it would do away with the party fund, that if the members were given $4,000 a year they would not be slaves to the party nor to the party fund. The best proof that that is not true is the voting as we have witnessed it in this House. Then is it asking too much—

Mr. VIEN: Would my hon. friend allow me a question? Does she mean that we are voting to-day in this House because we are dictated to by those who subscribed the electoral funds? Is that what my hon. friend means?

Miss MACPHAIL: The hon. member who asked the question knows the answer better than I do.

Mr. VIEN: Then, Mr. Chairman, I protest, and I rise to a point of order. I am extremely sorry to call my lady colleague to order but I cannot bear either her or anybody else to say that my vote in this House is being dictated by those who contribute my electoral funds. I for one received no electoral funds from anybody under the sun either in my election of 1917 or my election of 1921, and I would like to know how much my hon. friend received herself from the associations who support the party that sends her here. My hon. friend in committee and in the House—

Mr. GARDINER: Order.

Mr. VIEN: I am speaking on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the point of order that is being discussed.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend in committee as well as in the House is prompt to say that our votes are dictated by the powers that be or by big interests. I for one at least protest against that habit, and I for one at least may say that my votes are dictated only by my conscience. I trust that the votes of my hon. friend are the same.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have the right to ask my hon. friend to withdraw that aspersion.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. gentleman desire to speak on the point of order? Does the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) desire to speak on the point of order?

Miss MACPHAIL: If I have anything to say on the point of order I would say that the hon. gentleman doth protest too much. I did not accuse anybody. I simply said this. I will quote from the member who is now the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: Withdraw.

Miss MACPHAIL: When I have explained my position it will be time to withdraw.

Mr. BUREAU: Explain or withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Southeast Grey to proceed. I understand that she was going to repeat what was said. I did not get it very clearly and I am anxious to get that.

Miss MACPHAIL: I simply said that one of the pleas in 1920 for increasing the indemnity was that it would do away with the party fund, and the fact that it did not do away with the party fund is best proven by the voting in the House.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is a reflection on the whole House. That is what you should take back.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless the hon. member is going to speak to the point of order I will give my ruling.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am speaking to the point of order. The present Speaker of the House of Commons in 1920 said:

> The independence of parliament will be secured by the adoption of this measure. Let us extirpate the corruptions which the party fund at the general election engenders, creates and perpetuates.

Mr. VIEN: I rise again to the point of order. I think that the hon. member is not arguing the point of order. I will listen with great pleasure to my hon. friend arguing the point of order, but I think I am entitled to a ruling if my hon. friend continues her main argument.

Miss MACPHAIL: This is on the party fund entirely.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is whether the language of the hon. member reflected on the honour and integrity of the members of the House of Commons. If she desires to speak on that particular point as to whether her words should be so interpreted, I shall be very pleased to hear her before giving my ruling.

Miss MACPHAIL: I thought that if I quoted what a good man who had been in the party I believe for as long as twenty-five years had said about party funds, that would be on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is whether the words used by the hon. member should be interpreted as reflecting on the honour and integrity of the members of the House of Commons.

Mr. SHAW: I would suggest that the hon. member for Lotbiniere has perhaps put too literal an interpretation on the words used by the hon. member for Southeast Grey. I think that she had no desire to pass any reflection on the members of the House at all.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Let her say so then.

Mr. SHAW: If the hon. member will give her an opportunity perhaps we may have the privilege of hearing what she has to say, but I did not understand her to say she had any desire to pass any reflection on any member of the House of Commons.

Mr. MORIN: She did the very same thing in the Banking committee.

Mr. PUTNAM: What would the hon. member from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) take from the words which are under challenge?

Mr. SHAW: Perhaps the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam) can tell us how he would interpret her language.

Mr. PUTNAM: I would take it that its significance was a general accusation of bribery, that the members of the House of Commons are following the behests of those who supply the party funds. I am sorry to say that the words were not ambiguous.

Mr. FORKE: Speaking on the point of order, I think probably the member for Southeast Grey made a mistake, but had she been more accustomed to the rules of the House of Commons and had the experience of a great many members she would have been able to convey exactly the same thing and keep within the rules. I do not think the House is very much hurt by what has been said. I would advise the hon. member to withdraw, but I do not think there is very much to be gained by this terrible excitement over the simple remark she made.

Mr. VIEN: If the hon. member for Southeast Grey would only say what the leader

of the Progressive party has just said I would be satisfied, but we do not hear those words from her lips.

Miss MACPHAIL: I have no desire to reflect on the honour of any member of this House.

Mr. VIEN: Then I shall have to ask my hon. friend what she meant by her language.

Mr. BIRD: I should like to know specifically what rule has been infringed by the hon. member for Southeast Grey. I think the charge made is a very general one and if there is such a rule of the House I think that rule has been violated many times during last session and the present one.

An hon. MEMBER: What are you speaking to?

Mr. BIRD: I am speaking to the point of order if there is one.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order.

Mr. BIRD: Mr. Chairman, will you kindly state the point of order so that we may know what to do.

The CHAIRMAN: A point of order was raised that the hon. member for Southeast Grey had made a statement which reflects upon the independence of the members of the House of Commons and upon their integrity. That particular point is under discussion; that is the point of order.

Mr. BIRD: I remember distinctly that last session, I think it was in the debate upon the Address, two distinct charges were made from the benches to my right that the government had been returned to power by certan interests in this country. Those charges were allowed to go unchallenged. I think it is the rule in this House to permit general charges of that character as long as they are not personal. I do not know how this applies. On page 63 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms I find this paragraph:

> If a member should say nothing disrespectful to the House or the Chair, or personally opprobrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the House he may state whatever he may think fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character of individuals;

There is nothing personal in the statement of the hon. member for Southeast Grey but the general charge she made has been interpreted as being something personal. If a charge is personal it is against the rules of the House but that cannot be said of a general statement such as the hon. member made.

Mr. BOIVIN: I desire to say one word upon the point of order. If I understood the hon. member for Southeast Grey correctly, in the course of her remarks she made the statement that one of the reasons why the sessional indemnity had been increased in the year 1920 was the fact that it would do away with what is commonly known as an election fund, and she proceeded to base her statement upon a remark made in 1920 by the present Speaker of this House. Up to that point there was certainly no infringement of the rules of order. But the hon. member for Southeast Grey proceeded immediately afterwards to say that the increase of the indemnity did not have this effect as was proven by the votes given in the House at the present time. That is the statement complained of. If that statement means anything, it means that hon. members of this House owing to the fact that they have received campaign funds, or that they expect to receive campaign funds from some source, vote according to the dictates of the sources from which these funds are supplied. There can be no other interpretation to these words. I respectfully submit that under the ordinary rules and usages of parliament, it is forbidden for any hon. member to cast a reflection upon the honour and integrity of any individual member, or upon the honour or integrity of the House as a whole. If a reflection has not been cast upon an individual member, it certainly has been cast upon the integrity of the House as a whole, and for that reason the words should be retracted. If not retracted the hon. member for Southeast Grey should at least explain to the House that such was not the significance that she desired to give to the words that were uttered.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to ask the hon. member who has just spoken how he applies his present position and argument to the charges that have been frequently made in this House, according to my recollection, that the government or a certain party has been assisted into power, so to speak, by certain large financial interests. We have heard these charges commonly. I should therefore like to know how the particular point of order applies to cases like that?

Mr. BOIVIN: I may be allowed to reply to my hon. friend without departing from the point of order. The answer is very easy to give. In the one case, certain interests are accused of having elected members to this House and the accusation is levelled at some person or persons outside of the House. In

this particular instance, the members of this House are accused of voting in order to please those interests. There is a great difference between the two cases.

Mr. BIRD: I want to raise the point as to whether the remark in question is a reflection upon the honour of any member of this House, because I have heard it seriously contended that it is the duty of members who associate themselves with a party to vote according to the views of that party—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BIRD: —and for the reason that they are supported in this House by the party caucus. I am saying that quite seriously. That is seriously contended by those who argue against group government. And so I would say there is no direct onslaught upon the honour of any member of this House by the general reflection just made by the hon. member for Southeast Grey. I think it is stretching the point a little too far to say that is an attack upon the honour of any member of this House.

Mr. NEILL: I should like to point out that the hon. member for Southeast Grey qualified her remark. She stated definitely that she had no intention of reflecting on the integrity of any members of the House. That is a sufficient qualification and retraction of what she said before. As it has been customary to accept such a statement as a retraction I think we ought to pursue that course in her case as well as in others.

Miss MACPHAIL: I will withdraw the statement if it is unparliamentary and beg everybody's pardon. The thing I want to say, if I may be allowed to do so, is this: When some of the good party men have declared their views outside on certain questions and we see them come in and vote in the opposite way what are we to think? Let me continue with the quotation of what the present Speaker of the House said in his speech upon the increase in the indemnity He said:

> A party gets funds to elect its candidates, the men who contribute to that party fund expect the member elected in return for the aid received, will do the bidding of those who have paid the election expenses. Sir, I am right in saying that with the increased indemnities, the party fund will be a thing of the past, and if for no other reason the people of Canada would approve the action of parliament in this regard.

Recalling the argument that was advanced in 1920 for the increase in the indemnity, an argument in the very opposite direction can be made now in favour of a decrease. I believe that out of sympathy for the people in general because of the severe economic depression through which we are passing—we should do all we can to help and if we practise economy we will do much to strengthen the morale of the people and make them feel that we are indeed their servants and their brothers. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) that the words "four thousand" as they appear in section 32 be struck out and that the words "three thousand five hundred" be substituted therefor.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to make a few observations I should like to say that in 1920 I voted for the increased indemnity and I am prepared now to vote against this amendment. Furthermore, if I had a seconder I should be inclined to move an amendment providing that the indemnity should be $5,000 instead of $4,000 and I think the majority of the House would support me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Especially those who have many children.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Well it may come to that. I was under the impression in 1920 that members of parliament should be paid a reasonable indemnity to permit them to discharge their duties in a satisfactory manner and to give all time necessary to the affairs of this country. I think that by giving a fair indemnity, by paying a reasonable amount, men who are qualified in every way will be attracted to the service of their country. If that is not done professional or business men will not be induced to abandon their profession or their business, sometimes for eight months in the year, to attend to the affairs of the people in this House.

Mr. CARROLL: What about the children?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I will leave the answer to my hon. friend. It is well enough for any hon. member who has not very many obligations, who does not keep up a house in his own locality, or maintain a large family, to say that an indemnity of $2,000 a year is quite enough. It may be quite enough, and probably too much for some of those hon. members; but for anyone who has to leave his business for a certain period and keep up his household and family, and come here to Ottawa and remain for a few months under double expense, I think $4,000 is really too little under the circumstances. If the members of this House were well paid, I think it would be the means of attracting the best qualified men of the country to the House to represent the people of their districts.

Mr. STEVENS: I feel that something ought to be said in regard to this amendment. I have been in this House, as many other members have, for a great many years. I have witnessed from time to time resolutions of this kind moved with variant motives for a reduction of the indemnity paid to members. I happen to be in, perhaps, a fortunate position to-night, as far as I am personally concerned because, before the last election and subsequent to the increased indemnity, I was publicly asked, before an audience in Vancouver of perhaps two or three thousand citizens, my reasons for supporting the increased indemnity I answered the question as briefly as I could in such words as this, that if the electors of Vancouver did not consider that my services as a representative of that city were worth $4,000 the proper course would be to vote against me and leave me at home. I returned to this House with a majority of some 5,000 votes, which I consider at least vindicates my personal position in this matter.

I want to say something further, not perhaps so personal. I am inclined to think, Mr. Chairman, that if I attended the House not too assiduously, if I were present in my seat half of the time, if I did not give that attention to the matters coming before the House which I considered they certainly merited, and my conscience was still alive, I might hesitate to accept the full indemnity. I am not constituting myself a judge of the action of any member. It may be that some members do not give close attention to their duty. It is not my purpose or duty to judge of them. I am responsible for my own action, but I will say this with all the emphasis of which I am capable: that when I leave my home and family, maintain that home on the Pacific coast and live in Ottawa for approximately six months—and I think it will be fully six months by the time I get back to my home again—and attend to these duties as assiduously as I can, an indemnity of $4,000 a year is certainly not too much. There are members who have few responsibilities, or perhaps no responsibility, no family connections, no particular expenditure in maintaining a house, and no losses in business. They are happy and fortunate, from a monetary standpoint perhaps, and ahead of the game. If such a member feels that the indemnity under those circumstances is altogether too high, the remedy is very simple. Let him return to the coffers, as has been done by individual members, that portion of the indemnity which he feels he is not entitled to take. But I do wish to say that a member fortunately, or I think perhaps unfortunately, placed in that position, who has no responsibility or no ties of this kind, should not constitute himself a judge of what is due to those who certainly lose and lose heavily.

It might be advisable to say this—and I think I will be acquitted of any censoriousness in saying it—that a member should attend the sessions of this House closely and assiduously, should be in his seat regularly, sometimes perhaps for very long hours, should attend the committee work of the House and the variant duties which devolve upon a member of parliament in this country, and during the recess should give careful attention to the public welfare. If he does that, there is not too much in the indemnity for the services rendered. Furthermore I do not think the people of Canada begrudge any member of parliament who gives conscientious attention to his duties along these lines the indemnity which members have been drawing. Of course we all know perfectly well that there is a certain amount of glamour surrounding the so-called sacrifice of boldly moving in the House for the voluntary reduction of the indemnity, when that is positively or practically safeguarded by a general committal of the House to the indemnity before the question is brought up. That is a situation which has arisen in the past, and sometimes does present itself; but I do not appreciate very highly the action based on conditions and circumstances of that kind. It is not usual for a bill of this kind to be introduced in the House until it has been considered carefully by a committee, and until there has been knowledge of it, and an opportunity of expression of opinion, so that there may be reasonable unanimity; and that is a reasonable proposition. Under cover of that known unanimity or approximate unanimity, occasionally there are those who will say: So far as I am concerned I do not intend to accept this indemnity and I move for its reduction. I cannot very highly appreciate that course of action. Perhaps I have spoken plainly, but I do think when we are discussing a matter of this kind it is desirable to be very frank and very plain as to the position that we take.

Mr. FORKE: I do not wish to shirk stating my opinion upon this matter. I should like, in commencing, to pay a tribute to the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) for her sincerity of purpose and for the absolutely honesty of the attempt that she is making at the present time to reduce the indemnity. I do not know for a certainty, but I am credibly informed that she returned $1,500 of her salary last year—I may be wrong, but I think that was correct—and that is a

very good proof that she is quite in earnest in the move that she is making.

Mr. DUFF: She can do that again this year.

Mr. FORKE: That is so. Still, every member has a right to his or her opinions, and probably the moral effect may be worth thinking about if some sacrifice is attached to the action. I do not believe for one moment that the thing has been done for any spectacular effect. I am perfectly convinced that the action is sincere and honest right through.

As regards the amount, I cannot support the amendment. I know my own circumstances. I have rather a large farm; I have no boys of my own, and I have four hired men engaged there at the present time running my farm. I shall be away for nearly six months, and anyone who knows about conditions, knows exactly what it means to neglect the business for that time. I know what the expense of keeping a house in Ottawa is, and the expense of keeping a house in Manitoba and running back there. I am perfectly satisfied that I for one could not be in public life if the salary is going to be reduced very much lower than it is at the present time. I state that opinion sincerely, and I am quite prepared to take the verdict of my people at home. I am speaking simply because I want to place myself on record. I believe that members should conscientiously try to do their duty in the House; that they ought to give serious consideration to all questions that come up; that they should take their duty seriously. We are here in the parliament of Canada, and our actions have a tremendous effect for good or evil throughout this Dominion. Although not taking a very large part in the work of the House at times, I feel the responsibility of every act that we take, and I think, perhaps, the country will not begrudge us the salary of $4,000. In conclusion, let me say again, because I want to emphasize this, that I sincerely believe in the honesty of motive and purpose of the hon. member for Southeast Grey.

Amendment (Miss Macphail) negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Deduction for non-attendance.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, if you can hear my voice above the din of conversation, I should be glad to make a few remarks with regard to this clause, clause 3 of the bill dealing with section 35 of the original act. If hon. members will look at the act as it originally was, they will find that in the present bill before them, there has been deleted from subsection (1) the following words:

> Provided also that the deduction shall be made for every day on which a member does not attend a sitting of the House of which he is a member, during the last two weeks of any session of parliament.

The effect of the bill now introduced will be to relieve the members of that restriction. It is indeed significant that such a proposal should be brought to this House at this time. I would ask you, Sir: If there happened to be a provincial election in British Columbia or in Alberta and members from those provinces were to press for such a proposal as this, would it meet with the general approval of members of this House, or if it did, would it meet with the approval of the people of this country? Of the latter, there is no doubt in my mind. Their rejection of a proposal of that kind would probably be very loudly voiced. During the last two weeks of the last session, which is the only one excepting this one that I have had the privilege of being in this House, and during any other sessions of which hon. members have spoken to me, it appears almost a certainty, a constant happening, that during those two weeks there comes up the greatest bulk of the most important legislation. When that restriction was formerly introduced into the act, it was for the purpose of keeping members here who might otherwise be anxious to go on a holiday or to go home on business.

Mr. DUFF: That is rather a reflection on the members of parliament.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member will find that in Hansard if he will hunt it up.

Mr. DUFF: It does not matter where it is, it is a reflection.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It would not have been a reflection, but if it was, my hon. friend and his colleagues in those days supported the reflection. I see no good reason why that restriction should be lifted, especially this year. There is a great bulk of most important legislation to be dealt with. There is unfortunately only too great anxiety on the part of hon. members to dabble in provincial matters. I do not think it is in the best interest of this country that the restriction should be removed, and it is my intention to vote against this clause.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, with your kind permission, I wish to say a few words regarding the question under

discussion. My impression was that a number of members would give their views on the reduction of the parliamentary indemnity, because at the opening session of this Parliament, I was requested by a number of the Progressive party to give my opinion on this matter. They wanted me again to bring up the question; however, my answer was that I would support them if they would follow the course that I had taken.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that, in 1920, when the increase of the parliamentary indemnity was moved by Sir Robert Borden, then Prime Minister, he had stated in this House, on the 23rd of June, that he could not meet the wish of hon. gentlemen owing to there being too many pressing needs in behalf of the returned soldier and too many public works to be carried on in the country. A caucus took place on the following day, that is the 24th.

An hon. MEMBER: A Liberal or Conservative caucus?

Mr. LANCTOT: A Tory or rather a Unionist caucus. I was not present, however, it was rumoured that a revolt had broken out to the effect that should the Prime Minister not acquiesce to the wish of his party a strike would be called in the workshop. He had already been threatened with such a fate a few weeks previous because the Unionist party of the day had seen its majority of 71 dwindle down to 5. It was therefore agreed at that caucus to increase the parliamentary indemnity. The following day, on the 25th, a bill to that effect was brought down and the parliamentary indemnity was increased to $4,000 per year. At that time, I made my position clear: I moved an amendment against the parliamentary increase, not however, that I thought at the time no more than I do to-day that $4,000 was too much for the members to receive as an indemnity, but to me, it was a question of principle, I would not accept that amount from the hands of the master of the day, because I was fully aware that he would not be long at the head of the affairs of this country. This is the reason, I was the strongest opponent of the measure. We had at that time, as we have to-day a great deal of war expenditures; we had purchased a number of railways and I foresaw that once this increase was granted it would be difficult to remedy it. The hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) must have noticed it even to-day by the behaviour of those who induced her to propose that amendment when this measure was first introduced, I made up my mind to strongly oppose this increase of indemnity, and, should it be voted, to abstain from applying it to my own pecuniary advantage. My views in the meantime, have not changed. If the hon. members opposite me were sincere—especially those from Ontario as I am informed—when they proclaimed to the people, in 1921, that it was not worth more than $2,500 to be a member at Ottawa; if they were sincere at that time, they must necessarily be now, as I am, and if they always believe that this increase of $1,500 should never have been granted, why do they not distribute it to their electors as I have twice done. They must not pose to-day as champions of economy, preach against this increase and at the same time pocket the money for their personal benefit. That is why I thought it appropriate to make a few remarks. I insist on it, my views have not changed any and when I gave my word to this House that I would not benefit by this increase, I kept my word. I state in all frankness that I did not profit from such an increase. It has cost me $3,000 and I am not complaining over it.

Mr. LEADER: I want to register my protest against removing the restrictions in regard to the last fifteen days of the session of parliament. I am very sorry I was unable to grasp what was said by the last hon. gentleman (Mr. Lanctôt).

Mr. LANCTOT: Too bad.

Mr. LEADER: I am sorry, but I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is consistent; I quite believe that what he has been saying is in harmony with the language he used in this House a couple of years ago.

Mr. GERVAIS: He was simply saying that you were not consistent. He was complaining that your attitude was not consistent with what you said privately.

Mr. LEADER: I do not know what he said.

Mr. POWER: Do not talk about it then.

Mr. LEADER: The hon. gentleman made a speech in this House on the 29th day of June, 1920, and while I do not understand what he has said to-night I have no doubt his sentiments are the same as those he expressed at that time.

Mr. BOIVIN: They are the same.

Mr. LEADER: Let me quote what the hon. gentleman said:

> Now, even if it be true that an increase in salary is necessary, should this increase be made during the

present session? When a business man has hired a clerk in his office for $2,500 and this clerk comes to his employer three or four days before his year is up and says: "I want an increase of $1,500 for the work I have done this year," what does the boss say? He says: "That is out of the question. Finish your year and I'll settle with you." Well, that is the position of hon. members in this House, for the present session at any rate. The session is over. It has already come to an end for several, since they have taken their trunks and gone back to their homes. So the argument that members of parliament should receive more money does not apply to the present session at least, because the session is over, and the amount allowed was $2,500.

The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) opposes this clause for practically the same reasons. When hon. members get up and declare that it is the duty of public men to keep to their seats in this House and diligently perform their duties, I would ask them to look behind the hon. gentlemen who now sit in the front row to my right. Now I want to quote what the hon. gentleman who to-day dignifies the Speaker's chair said on the same occasion to which I have already referred.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I must remind the hon. member that the committee is discussing section 3, which relates to the deduction of indemnity for non-attendance. A general discussion is not permissible under that section and I must request the hon. member to confine his remarks to the subject matter under consideration.

Mr. LEADER: I respectfully submit that I am discussing a matter that is relevant to the section under consideration. However, if I am out of order I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and shall endeavour to confine myself to the subject matter before the Chair. The present Speaker of the House, speaking in favour of an increase used these words:

> There has been no regular attendance as there was in the old days when the indemnity was sufficient to keep members at Ottawa, to enable them to give their time to matters connected with the administration of public affairs. For many sessions now I have seen empty seats during sittings of the House, sometimes a practically empty Chamber. I do not say it boastfully, Mr. Speaker, but you know that I am a regular attendant at the sittings of the House, and time and again I have seen the House debate measures when there was hardly a quorum of members in attendance.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Order. The hon. member must confine his remarks to the section under discussion. A general debate is out of order at the present juncture.

Mr. FOURNIER: Why do you not make a speech of your own?

Mr. LEADER: I am reminded of a statement that is ascribed to the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier who, being unduly assailed in the House, declared that the lion always hunted alone, but the wolves hunted in packs. Now I do not pretend to be lion-like, but I do think that the latter truth might apply to hon. gentlemen opposite.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Be a sport.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The last remark made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) should, I think, be withdrawn. Any language that reflects directly or indirectly upon the character of hon. members is unparliamentary and should be retracted.

Mr. LEADER: I was only following an eminent precedent, Mr. Chairman. However, I withdraw the remark.

Mr. BUREAU: Give the lion a chance.

Mr. LEADER: (reading):

> Why is it that there is not the attendance at the sittings of the House which the people have the right to expect from their representatives?

Mr. MERCIER: The hon. gentleman should not be quoting irrelevant matter on this section.

Mr. FOURNIER: When he is paid $4,000, he ought to make a speech of his own.

Mr. LEADER: In order to expedite the business of the House—because no one is more anxious to get home than I am, although I am prepared to carry out my duties to the fullest extent—I shall bring my remarks to a close, especially in view of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are apparently determined to obstruct me. I simply wish to declare myself opposed to any attempt to remove the restrictions with regard to the last fifteen days of the session of parliament.

Mr. BOIVIN: Before the motion is carried I think a word should be said in answer to my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland) who, I am sure, was sincere in the remarks he made concerning the removal of the special restrictions applied to the last fifteen days of a session. I must point out, and I should like the press and the country as well as the House of Commons to understand, that the present bill has not for its object the giving of any permission to hon. members to leave the House during the last fifteen days any more than at any other time during the ses-

sion. If any hon. member is absent from the House for more than fifteen days during the session he is penalized to the extent of $25 for every day beyond the fifteen, whether the absence occurs at the beginning or during the latter part of the session. I am prepared to admit that much important legislation is introduced during the last days of the session but I also maintain that very many important measures are introduced during the first weeks. The budget speech and tariff resolutions, for instance, generally come before the last two weeks of the session, and there is nothing more important than the budget. The hon. member says that we should remain during the last weeks. I say we should remain all the time. The government cannot be blamed for the date or period when legislation is introduced. There is no desire on the part of the government to leave important legislation until the dying days of the session. This is due to the natural trend of events. Measures are submitted and sent to committees, and engage their attention during nearly the entire session, and it is only after the committees have reported to the House that such measures can be finally dealt with. I maintain that it is just as important for members to be present while those measures are being considered by committees before presentation to the House as when they go through the final stages in the House itself.

Apart from that, the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) says that this legislation should not be amended as proposed owing to the fact that certain members are now absent taking part in a provincial election. And he asks: What would be said if a provincial election were being held in Alberta and we were to leave the House to take part in it?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I suggested that in the event of a provincial election being held in Alberta, and we pressed for such an amendment, we might be criticized.

Mr. BOIVIN: I was just coming to that. He suggested that if in order to take part in such an election he pressed for this amendment, he might be blamed. I respectfully submit to the House that his electors are really the persons to say whether an hon. member should take part in a provincial election or not. The result of a provincial election may be very vital to the welfare of his particular riding, and his electors will seldom blame him for not attending to his duties in the House of Commons at that time. If the electors in the various constituencies where federal members are taking part in the provincial elections—and are therefore in their own way looking after the interests of their constituents—think it would be better for their representatives to remain in the House of Commons, they have their redress, they can vote against those members in the next election and so punish them. But it will be found that in every instance where a provincial election does take place, the electors are keenly disappointed if the federal member takes no part in it but remains at Ottawa to draw his indemnity. Furthermore, a provincial election might take place at some other stage of the session, and under the law as it now stands upon the statute book hon. members could be absent for fifteen days to take part in that election and would not be fined if they were regular in their attendance during the rest of the session.

But there is another view to take. The hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) in suggesting an amendment which we were glad to accept and incorporate in the bill, stated that if a session lasted for fifty days or over, and some hon. members were absent during the first fifty days, it would be necessary to keep the House in session for another fifteen days in order that they might draw their full indemnity. In the present instance if some hon. members desired to allow their colleagues to take part in the provincial elections in Ontario or in any other province at any other time, they could certainly block legislation for fifteen days to enable those members to come back and escape being fined for their fifteen days' absence. The result would be to put the country to extra expense and nothing would be gained. I respectfully submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the committee that when this matter was discussed by the joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate there was no desire to relieve any hon. member from attendance in this House. The desire was to make the rule fair, just and equitable for all members at all times during a session. We felt, as I have already explained, that if an hon. member was called away for some reason of urgent public importance in his constituency or for legitimate family reasons during the latter part of a session, he should be treated absolutely the same as the hon. member who happened to be called away for similar reasons during an earlier period of the session.

There is no doubt that when the law was amended in 1920 it was done hastily. If I remember rightly the hon. leader of the party then in power declared in the House about two weeks before the law was amended that there would be no amendment and that the indemnity would not be increased. Pressure

was brought to bear upon him and he became convinced by the arguments of his supporters —and I say this with no intention of disparaging the hon. gentleman—that the indemnity should be raised to $4,000. Thereupon legislation was hastily prepared and introduced for the purpose of making the rules more rigid. We have carried out that intention in the present amending act. We have fixed the duration of a session at sixty-five days instead of thirty before any member of this House can draw his full indemnity of $4,000. We have also increased the attendance of the individual member from thirty to fifty days. In spite of the lengthy sessions we have not sought to increase the days of absence although the question was raised in the committee and we have been requested by some hon. members to increase the number of days during which a member could be absent without sacrificing any part of his indemnity. We did not think such a change would be in the interests of the country. The fine for absence has been increased from $15 to $25 a day. I want once more to make it perfectly clear that this legislation does not give wholesale permission to members to be absent during the last fifteen days but only treats those days on the same basis as all the other days of the session which are equally important.

1 a.m.

Mr. LEADER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remark of the last speaker that the electors are the best judges of whether their representative should be here or not. I would suggest, in view of the fact that the electors are not always cognizant of the attitude of the member in the House and at times have no means of finding out, that we have some form of registration such as obtains in the Senate—that every day the roll be called and each member's name be taken down. I might add that the present Speaker of the House in 1920—

Mr. VIEN: Would my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. LEADER: —made this same suggestion. Sir Robert Borden in reply said that he had discussed the matter with Sir Wilfrid Laurier who agreed that it was the proper course to take, but he said that the other members of the committee chased them to the tall timbers or words to that effect. I suggest most respectfully that that rule be adopted and that we register the members every day in the House.

Mr. VIEN: I respectfully suggest that I respect the oath of a member of parliament who declares at the end of every month his days of attendance as much as an attendance record kept by a servant of the House.

Mr. LEADER: Then why object to the roll call?

Mr. BUREAU: We do not want to go back to school.

Mr. BOIVIN: There is a slight amendment which must now be made. It is merely a consequential amendment and arises from the fact that the length of the session in section 1 has been increased from fifty to sixty-five days. It is to amend clause 3 by inserting after the words "any session" in the second line of section 37, which is the seventeenth line on page 2, the following words, "extending over a period of sixty-five days or more." I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOIVIN: There is another consequential amendment rendered necessary by the same change. It is now provided that in every session of parliament under fifty days the member shall be paid a salary of $25 for each day's attendance. I beg to move that clause 3 be amended by striking out the word "and" in the first line by inserting after the word "thirty-seven" in the same line the words "and thirty-eight" and by adding at the end of the said clause, the following:

"38. In every session of parliament covering a period of less than sixty-five days, there shall be payable to every member of the Senate and House of Commons attending at such session, twenty-five dollars for each day's attendance."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

On the motion of Sir Lomer Gouin for the third reading of the bill:

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Medicine Hat): This legislation has come before the House in a very hurried manner and I feel that the House has not had sufficient opportunity to go properly into this question in order that we may be assured of exactly what we are voting for. It is very regrettable indeed that legislation should have been brought down to this House and decided upon in such a short space of time. Therefore, I move:

That Bill No. 232 be not now read a third time but that it be read this day six months.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): I beg to move:

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

That bill No. 232 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend section 32 thereof by striking out the words "four thousand" wherever they appear in said section and substituting therefor the words "three thousand five hundred".

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): In connection with the main motion I want to suggest that this question of fixing the indemnities of members of parliament by the members themselves is a very unfortunate matter. It would be very desirable if the indemnity could be fixed by some other organization, by somebody outside.

Mr. PARENT: The Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to order and to be heard in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SHAW: I want to suggest that at the time the application was made for an increase in the indemnity in 1920, in my humble judgment, and I only offer it as a humble judgment, no adequate reason was given for the increase of the indemnity to the amount suggested. I have no doubt that facts did exist which justified an increase of some character, but whether it justified an increase to $4,000 is more than I know. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Southeast Grey this evening also, if I may respectfully suggest it, contained no adequate reason for a reduction to the amount suggested. I want to say, however, that so far as I am concerned I would have no objection if called upon, to vote for the reduction proposed by the hon. member for Southeast Grey, not that I think any substantial reason was urged but simply as an earnest of the desire of the House to economize wherever possible and for the other reason that I feel it is unfortunate that motives should be imputed to members of this House. It is one of those matters in which no matter what action you take you are, so far as the public is concerned, damned if you do one thing and damned if you do the other.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. Black, Yukon) moved the second reading of Bill No. 44, to amend the Yukon Act.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On section 1—Recovery or defining of claims, mining property or mineral locations.

Mr. STEVENS: I will briefly explain this bill and in doing so I wish to expressly thank the Minister of Justice for his courtesy in permitting it to come up. This is a somewhat technical and formal amendment to the Yukon Act. The Yukon Act, as originally drafted, provided for trials, and so forth, but did not include provision for jury trials in certain cases. The reason for it was this: When Yukon was first opened up and this act was originally passed it was in the days of what was known as "the stampede." Conditions there were in an exceedingly disturbed state, and it was felt that it was not desirable to place such cases as mineral claims and disputes under jury trial as was the case in all other provinces. That condition has long since passed, twenty years ago or nearly so, and to-day Yukon is just as settled and as sober --shall I say?—in its thought and in its administration as any other part of Canada. All the feverish excitement has long since passed. This is simply to give to Yukon rights which are enjoyed by the other provinces.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have an amendment to offer to this section. The first clause provides for an appeal on interlocutory and final judgments in mining property cases. I do not think it would be advisable to permit appeals on interlocutory judgment; we should limit the appeal to final judgments. I therefore propose to amend the clause so that it will read:

1. Section forty-six of the Yukon Act, chapter sixty-three of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by section two of chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1912, is amended by adding at the end of subsection two thereof the following:—"or if the action be for the recovery of a claim, mining property, mineral claim or location, as defined by the Yukon Placer Mining Act, chapter sixty-four of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, or by the regulations for the disposal of quartz mining claims on Dominion lands in the Yukon territory, or of any interest therein or to establish title thereto, or for the definition of or establishment of the boundaries of any such claim, mining property, mineral claim or location, or to establish the right of a claimant to any such claim, mining property, mineral claim or location or interest therein, or to have included within said claim, mining property, mineral claim or location, any land or property, or if the action be for divorce or judicial separation.

This will give an appeal in mining property cases for final judgments only.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 2—Action for recovery, etc., of claims, mining property or mineral locations.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 2 provides for a jury trial in mining property cases, as in the province of British Columbia, and also in cases of divorce and judicial separation.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Sir Lomer Gouin the House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, June 22, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Mr. COPP (for Mr. Malcolm) presented the second and final report of the special committee appointed to inquire into the operation of the Civil Service Act.

He said: I beg to give notice, on behalf of Mr. Malcolm, that he will move on Monday next that the second and final report of the special committee be concurred in.

PRIVATE BILLS

SUSPENSION OF RULE

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa) moved that rule 103 relating to the posting of private bills in the lobby and in the votes and proceedings be suspended for the remainder of the session.

Mr. STEVENS: I think, if I recall rightly, the custom has been to make a motion with regard to any individual bill that appears to be too late for the usual notice at the end of the session, and not to propose an omnibus resolution of this kind.

Mr. McGIVERIN: This has been the custom for many years toward the end of the session on account of bills coming from the Senate. There are three or four divorce bills coming over on Tuesday or Wednesday which will have to be considered by the Private Bills committee, and a delay of twenty-four hours at this stage might prevent one or more of these bills from being passed this session.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

Mr. STEVENS: I think such a motion should be preceded by a report from the Private Bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING

Bill No. 223 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jessie Anne Epstein.—Mr. Duff.

PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 237, to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act.

Mr. STEVENS: Explain.

Mr. BUREAU: If hon. members will look at the bill they will see that the measure speaks for itself. The amendments proposed are indicated in italics. The object of the proposed change is to permit the sale of naphtha. Under the present act the Governor in Council can regulate the possession, storage and transportation of naphtha and its sale is restricted except for certain purposes. In its present form the act reads:

> Naphtha shall not be sold or offered for sale in Canada for illuminating purposes except,—
>
> (a) for use in street lamps in which only the vapour is burned; or
>
> (b) for use in dwellings, factories and other places of business when vapourized in secure underground tanks outside the buildings in which the vapour so generated is used for lighting.

We want to make regulations so that the sale will be permitted for lighting purposes. This is rendered necessary by the invention of the Coleman lamp which has been put on the market and is going into general use. Doubtless hon. members are all familiar with the Coleman lamp. The insurance companies and the best experts in the United States have declared that it is perfectly safe. As the law now stands, a dealer or a man who has naphtha in his possession cannot sell it for illuminating purposes except as restricted by the general statute. The purpose of the present bill is to permit the sale of naphtha for illuminating purposes under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: Strictly speaking this bill should have been preceded by a resolution but, perhaps, at this stage of the session that requirement might be dispensed with.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

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

Mr. BUREAU: Now.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: This bill will be considered later on, under government orders.

Mr. BUREAU: It has been printed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MORNING SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved, seconded by Sir Lomer Gouin:

That on and after Tuesday the 26th day of June until the end of the present session, the House shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning of each day, except Sundays, and that in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock, p.m., there shall be also, an intermission every day from one till 3 o'clock p.m., and that the various committees of the House be at liberty to sit during the sessions of the House.

Motion agreed to.

AUDIT BOARD

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister, for the Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide:—

1. That the Governor in Council may appoint a Board of Audit to hold office until the first day of July, 1925, and to be composed of four members, one of whom shall be the Auditor General, one the Deputy Minister of Finance, and the two remaining members shall be public accountants of high standing;

2. That the public accountants, members of the said board, may be paid for their services such reasonable sums, not exceeding $3,000 each, in any one year as the Treasury Board may allow; and that the Treasury Board may allow the payment, out of any available appropriation, of necessary amounts for skilled assistants engaged by the board;

3. That the said board shall have the following duties and powers:—

(a) to inquire into and report upon the present system of audit of the public revenue and expenditure of Canada and to make recommendations for the more effective control of the same;

(b) to inquire into the systems of accounting employed by the Canadian National Railway Company and its constituent companies and any commission or other public body whose operations are carried on by appropriations from the treasury, and such other undertakings or services belonging to or receiving aid from the government of Canada as the Minister of Finance may direct, and to make recommendations with respect thereto;

4. That the members of the board shall for the purposes of these resolutions have the same power as is given to the Auditor General of Canada with respect to the various departments of the Dominion government.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

271½

FINANCE ACT, 1914

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister, for the Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to continue in force certain of the provisions of The Finance Act, 1914, and to provide:—

1. That the Minister of Finance may make advances to the chartered banks and to the Savings banks to which the Quebec Savings Bank Act, 1913, applies by the issue of Dominion notes upon the pledge of certain securities, such advances to be repayable within one year with interest at such rate as may be from time to time fixed by the Treasury Board.

2. That the provisions of the proclamation dated 3rd September, 1914, made under the authority of the Finance Act, 1914, so far as they authorize the chartered banks to make payments in their notes instead of in gold or Dominion notes, and so far as they suspend the redemption in gold of Dominion notes be continued in force for a period not exceeding three years after the date of the coming into force of any enactment founded on this resolution; provided that the Governor in Council by proclamation may declare and proclaim an earlier date for the termination of any enactment which may be founded on this resolution; and

3. That the Governor in Council during a period not exceeding three years after the date of the coming into force of any enactment founded on this resolution may by proclamation from time to time and for any period or periods declare and proclaim that the export of gold coin, gold bullion and fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada shall be prohibited except in such cases as may be deemed desirable by the Minister of Finance and under licenses to be issued by him; provided that the Governor in Council by proclamation may declare and proclaim an earlier date for the termination of any enactment which may be founded on this resolution.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION —Mr. GERVAIS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. THEODORE GERVAIS (Berthier): Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to explain a statement reported in yesterday's Hansard when I interrupted the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader). I am reported to have said:

He was simply saying that you were not consistent.

These words are quite correct, but they did not apply exclusively to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. The hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) in his speech, had referred to the Progressive members sitting opposite, mainly those coming from the province of Ontario, and when the

hon. member for Portage la Prairie spoke of consistency, I used the words I have just quoted. My allusion was to the members designated by the member for Laprairie and Napierville, and not exclusively to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie.

REDISTRIBUTION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): A matter of great public importance was referred to in the Speech from the Throne. The session is now nearing an end. I do not know what has happened, but no mention has been made of the question of redistribution. Is it likely that that committee on that subject will make a report? Or what steps will be taken in connection with this matter? Can the government give any information?

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou, Acting Minister of National Defence): I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I had expected to hold a meeting of that committee this week, but owing to the fact that a great many members, the larger number being from the Ontario constituencies, were absent, I have been unable to hold the meeting. I propose giving notice of the meeting for Tuesday next, when these members will have returned from the elections, and the matter will be dealt with.

THE UNION BANK

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FORKE: I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House, under rule 39, for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely to call attention to certain statements appearing in the press, apparently of an authentic nature, regarding the financial position of the Union Bank of Canada and the necessity of safeguarding the public interest in every possible way.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps my hon. friend will consent to allow this motion to stand over until eight o'clock this evening. I think the Finance Minister will be in his place at that time. I think it would be preferable to take up the matter then.

Mr. FORKE: That will be quite acceptable, with the stipulation that we have the right of way at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly, that is understood—after Private Bills.

[Mr. Gervais.]

APPEALS FROM CONVICTIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) in reference to Bill No. 106, which stands in my name on the order paper. This bill is entitled "An Act to Extend the Right of Appeal from Convictions for Indictable Offences." That bill, of course, cannot be reached at this session. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) if he would consider the advisability of taking over this bill as a government measure for next session. It is a very important measure. It was passed unanimously by the Senate after a full and complete investigation by a special committee, whose report also I believe, was unanimous. I think Canada is the only country in the world where the right of appeal is not given.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): I cannot make a promise that I will take the bill over as a government measure. I understand this is a very important question, and we are now in communication with the attorneys general of the provinces in regard to it. The provinces are interested because they have to pay for the administration. I am now studying the question. I do not promise that next session I will ask my colleagues to make this a government measure; but it is a very interesting point and it is possible that we shall make it a government measure.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE AND ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. GOOD: When will the House have an opportunity of discussing the agenda of the Imperial Conference and the Economic Conference to be held this fall?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have mentioned, I think, several times, that when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, they will contain an item to make provision for the Economic Conference and the Imperial Conference, and that will be the appropriate time, I think, for the discussion to take place. I hope the Supplementary Estimates will be brought down possibly by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I cannot give my hon. friend a definite assurance, but I will endeavour to see that that item is brought up at an early stage.

Mr. GOOD: Will it be brought up not earlier than Tuesday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I will promise my hon. friend that it will not be brought up before Tuesday.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT, 1914. AMENDMENT

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

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914, by providing:—

1. That a minimum standard of fat in butter be established;

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered by proclamation to permit the importation, manufacture and sale of renovated butter in Canada;

3. That the manufacture, importation, selling, offering or having in possession for sale of milk or cream which contains any fat or oil other than that of milk be prohibited;

4. That regulations may be made respecting (a) records being kept by manufacturers and dealers in butter, renovated butter and cheese, and for the examination of such records by inspectors; (b) the importation, manufacture, inspection, marking, advertising and sale of renovated butter; (c) the registration of all cheese factories and creameries in Canada, and the compulsory use of an assigned number on the product of each factory or on the packages containing said product;

5. That penalties for violation of the regulations be increased, and methods established for proving the guilt of persons charged with infractions of the act as amended, and for the procedure to be followed in all such cases.

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

On clause 2.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can we get an explanation of this from the minister?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This whole resolution was associated with the Dairy Industry Act, which was discharged from the Order Paper two or three weeks ago, with one important difference, that difference being in clause 2 which we are now discussing. The reason that I have incorporated this clause in the present resolution and did not have it in the resolution when it was previously before the House, is this. Last year when the discussion was up on the oleomargarine question, I took the ground that, in my opinion, a better solution of the question of a cheap spread for bread was renovated butter and not oleomargarine. Last year the House did not take my statement very seriously, and as the question was not before the House, I suppose they were justified in assuming that attitude. At the same time I gave my assurance that if the oleomargarine resolution met with the same decision last year as it has this year, I would immediately advise my colleagues that in my estimation it would be a good idea to remove the prohibition on the manufacture of renovated butter. Inasmuch, however, as the vote of the House last year was in favour of continuing the manufacture of oleomargarine, there was no call for such action. This year I had no occasion to make any remarks with regard to the question of oleomargarine, as the matter seemed to be in a fairly good condition, and I was afraid that possibly I might spoil it by saying anything. Nevertheless, had I said anything, I would have re-stated my position as regards renovated butter as a cheap bread spread for the poor man. I feel called upon to implement that pledge of last year. I will read from Hansard just one extract indicating what I said, and I will not read any more than is necessary. I said:

I am prepared, if my colleagues will agree with me, to take that prohibition off by legislation this session—

That was last session.

—as a means of giving real relief; as a means of giving butter which is not 2 per cent butter—some of my friends here claim that they have had enough 2 per cent—but 100 per cent butter with 100 per cent food content.

That was my statement last year and although I did not repeat it in the House for the reasons I have indicated, I have repeated it in letters to various individuals throughout Canada. I stated to these parties that I recognized that there was an argument in favour of some kind of cheap spread for bread for people who could not—or felt that they could not—afford to buy creamery butter; that inasmuch as oleomargarine was a commodity of which nobody knew the ingredients, it was, in my estimation defective in food properties. As the House has decided to revert to the old order of things by a resolution passed recently, I am here to carry out my statement as regards the manufacture of renovated butter.

As this is a comparatively new question, the people of Canada do not know much about renovated butter. It has been prohibited for twenty years, and because it has been prohibited for so long it is a comparatively new question to possibly ninety-five per cent of the people. What is this new article and what is the history of its prohibition? In order to give an answer to that question, we have in this resolution and in a bill associated with it, merely asked that the Governor in Council be given power by proclamation to provide for the manufacture of this product. It is not proposed to authorize this immediately. A period will elapse, to be determined by the amount of requests for the manufacture of renovated butter. If nobody

calls for the manufacture of it, if the labour organizations, the women's organizations, the miners' organizations, the lumber organizations, and any others, make no requests, the chances are that no proclamation will be issued, inasmuch as this would indicate that there was no demand.

Why am I bringing in this bill? In the first place, because I want to carry out my statement; and, secondly, because I believe there is room in our domestic economy for such a product as renovated butter. The question is a considerable one that presents many phases, and later on, if the discussion is protracted, I may find it necessary to deal with some of the details. In the meantime my primary object is to meet a demand which I am convinced exists. There has been some criticism with regard to the question of importation. Some critics take the ground that there would be no objection to providing a market for the dairy butter made by the pioneer settler, by putting it into proper shape to be sold before it deteriorated to too great an extent. It sometimes happens that butter shipped to an outside market becomes bad when it is a long time in transit; occasionally it is not shipped in refrigerator cars, and by the time it reaches Minneapolis, say, or New York, it is in a worse condition than renovated butter manufactured and sold on the Canadian market. There is the assurance, as embodied in the resolution, that the manufacture of renovated butter will be legal only upon the issuance of a proclamation; and personally I would not mind incorporating in the bill a provision that no such proclamation should be issued within a year, or at least until there was an evident demand from those most concerned. I want to assure the committee that I have no desire whatever to thrust anything like this upon the market if there is no demand for it; but there is undoubtedly a certain amount of demand on the part of the wholesale produce dealers who handle our dairy butter. People have repeatedly written to me, particularly from the West, wanting to know, inasmuch as this article is produced by farmers, and was the only kind of butter we had fifty years ago, why it should be banished from the country in summary fashion, having to climb a tariff wall of eight cents a pound to get into the United States. It is further pointed out that the local country stores experience considerable difficulty in finding a market for it. It is urged that provision should be made for the manufacture of it in Canada, and I think it may very reasonably be inferred from all the circumstances that there is at least sufficient demand to warrant the action we propose taking. The night the oleomargarine debate concluded, about ten days ago, some hon. gentlemen asked me why I did not bring down a measure with regard to renovated butter; and one person particularly pointed out that inasmuch as the poor people were going to be deprived of oleomargarine there was no reason why this other substitute, or rather this form of butter, should not be manufactured. That, Mr. Chairman, is briefly a summary of the situation. I may remark, by the way, that I have referred the matter to my colleagues who have agreed to the proposal, believing it to be a good one.

Mr. GOOD: Will the minister explain to the committee how renovated butter is made? What is the composition of it? Is it defined?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have been trying to ascertain the quality of the product during the past five or six years; in fact, before coming here at all I was interested in the subject. The moment that the manufacture of oleomargarine was permitted there immediately arose the question why this product should be banished from the market. I have had some correspondence with American manufacturers in reference to this matter, and one letter that I have received is particularly interesting. I shall not read the whole of the letter because I think it is rather too long to put on Hansard. But it is from an authority in Chicago, a man who, I may say, is not a manufacturer of renovated butter but a real dairyman whose interests are rather, if anything, opposed to this product. Still inasmuch as renovated butter is a recognized and standard article on the market, being quoted just the same as creamery butter, it is well that there should be no misapprehension regarding its nature and value. Renovated butter is usually quoted about halfway between creamery butter and oleomargarine. About a fortnight ago oleomargarine let us say, stood at 30 cents—I am not giving the exact figures, of course, but the proportions are true—while creamery butter was quoted at 40 cents. Renovated butter then would fetch 4 cents more than oleomargarine and 6 cents less than creamery butter. Sometimes the variation is exactly midway between the two extremes of oleomargarine and creamery butter. The letter to which I have referred comes from Mr. G. L. McKay, secretary of the American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers. It is not addressed to me personally, because I am not acquainted with Mr. McKay, but my department is constantly in touch with the organization of which Mr. McKay is

secretary, and the letter from which I am about to quote was written to Mr. J. A. Ruddick, the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner. Mr. McKay gives a good deal more information than we asked for, but it is all very interesting. We merely inquired, by telegram, the value of renovated butter as a food product as compared with butter and other articles: we were anxious to know what part these mysterious vitamines played in this particular foodstuff. Mr. McKay says:

There is nothing about renovated butter that should make it in any way unwholesome. Ladles or farm butter is gathered together and melted at a moderate heat. The pure butterfat or oil is pumped from the melting vat into funnel shaped tanks and air is blown through it, and that removes any odours that may adhere to the fat.

I may explain here that one of the reasons why dairy butter does not always keep is the fact that it is salted with exceedingly coarse salt, and often there is too much water left in it. Frequently, too, an excess of buttermilk or curd is left in the butter and its keeping properties are consequently impaired, so that it becomes rancid if not kept in cold storage.

When the oil becomes odourless it runs into cold water where it goes back into butter flakes, looking very much like butter granules. A starter is added to this,—

Sometimes people take this word "starter" to indicate a chemical compound, but it is nothing more nor less than sour cream. It is put into the churn to promote acidity. Seldom do we find dairy butter made from entirely sweet milk; there is always a slight acidity to it.

—and the granules in the same conditions stay in the starter for some time, and it is then worked in the usual manner. Some pour the starter into the oil, I understand, before it runs into the water to be congealed; in other words, renovated butter is butter that has not been made right on the farm. It contains too much salt, or too much water, or too much curd. It is usually churned at too high a temperature and contains a lot of curd. Coarse salt is frequently used, and butter of a poor character is the result.

I will venture the suggestion, without knowing much about the business of some of my hon. friends opposite, that they have often been tempted themselves to raise the temperature of cream to make it "come."

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister speak from experience?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do.

Mr. SHAW: Might that remark be considered a reflection on members on this side?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not at all; I think it ought to be taken as a compliment. If hon. gentlemen are not familiar with these things, then there is something lacking in their agricultural knowledge. Mr. McKay says:

The business has gone back in this country—

That is, the United States.

—very much due to the fact there are not as many farmers now making their own butter. The centralized system has extended so much in our country and covers such a wide territory and cream is shipped such a long distance that the farmers that used to make their own butter and trade it for groceries are selling their cream to the centralizers. Cream buying stations are scattered all over the United States. The farmer now brings in his cream in a crock or pail if he only has two or three cows, and if he has more he brings it in a can. It is only in scattered districts that the farmer is still making butter.

As far as purity goes, I can see no reason but what renovated butter is as clean and pure as any butter that is made.

As hon. gentlemen know, it depends on the buttermaker. I think half the people of Canada would prefer dairy butter if they could get it of good quality. In many instances they can and do get a good quality, because the product of a home dairy, made from one herd, under the supervision of one person who is a capable buttermaker, is at least quite equal to the average creamery butter.

I have seen some of it that would score 94 or 95. This depends somewhat upon the quality of the raw material, or the quality of the butter that was melted and the manner of making it. In scoring contests I have run across it several times put in as creamery butter. I invariably have been able to detect it by letting it dissolve in my mouth.

One of the reasons why renovated butter was prohibited was not because of its quality generally, but because those in charge of the dairy industry at that time were afraid that it might be mixed with creamery butter and jeopardize our market in the United Kingdom. Since then, however, we have instituted a grading system, so that this objection does not apply to-day as it did twenty years ago.

There is a slight oily taste. Then if it is broken apart on the trier, the grain is rather fine and glistens a little more than the ordinary creamery butter.

The word "grain" is not used very much now; we speak of "texture".

I talked with Mr. W. S. Moore, commission merchant, who used to be head of a large process factory, after receiving your telegram.

It used to be called "process butter".

He recommended it very highly although he is not dealing in it at the present time. He said that he has bought as much as ten or twelve carloads of ladle butter from northwest Canada a year, and he thinks in a country where there are a lot of farmers butter made especially of an irregular quality that a renovated factory would be a good thing.

In the wire sent to this gentleman there was no suggestion that we wanted information of this kind. Apparently in view of the situation

in the United States he wondered why Canada did not renovate its homemade butter. This is a long letter and I do not think I need read any further.

Mr. FORKE: During the debate on oleomargarine the trouble feared seemed to be the mixing of butter with oleo. Is there any danger in this case of the mixing of oleomargarine with butter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not anticipate any danger from oleomargarine inasmuch as the right to manufacture it will expire in August and it cannot be offered for sale after March next. But there is a danger of this renovated butter being mixed with creamery butter, and therefore if its manufacture is permitted it will have to be subject to the stipulation that it be manufactured in an entirely separate building, so there will not be the least temptation to work it into creamery butter. That is the danger which exists to-day with regard to oleomargarine. As a matter of fact "manna" consists of oleo mixed with butter. This bill prohibits the mixing of any foreign fats with butter. It provides that butter shall consist of eighty per cent butter fat, and this leaves no room for foreign fats as the other 20 per cent consists of salt and water.

Mr. KNOX: Where does the minister expect to get a market for the renovated butter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Very much the same market that oleomargarine now supplies—those who want a cheap spread. In the United States renovated butter is made of such a generally high standard that the market is not confined to the poorer people, the price being within six cents of creamery butter. I hope the committee, Mr. Chairman, will not look upon me as an ardent advocate of the use of inferior butter. I am not anxious to press renovated butter upon an unwilling country. I simply want to redeem my promise that this opportunity of obtaining a cheap spread would be given.

As a pioneer in Manitoba, I am sure the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) must have made a considerable amount of butter. I can recall the time, too, when the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Hopkins) was a trail blazer in improving dairying in the old Northwest Territories. They will remember that at that time there was nothing but dairy butter made; and this has always been the case with our early settlers. At the present time, the surplus of our dairy butter after supplying the home requirements has to get over the eight-cent American tariff wall and the handicap of express and freight charges. The result is that the price paid to the frontier man is very very small, especially since the Fordney tariff went into force. Consequently this is one of the advantages of introducing renovated butter at this time if the people want it—a home market will be provided. Nobody is going to force renovated butter on the people; and that is why we want an educative campaign throughout the country. The people do not understand what renovated butter is. It is simply the dairy butter that most of us were brought up on, which, having become rancid, is put in a condition fit for food. I am sure that any pioneer in Canada who had to keep the wolf from the door, as I and many others did, by making dairy butter, will have compassion upon the frontier man who still relies on his output of dairy butter during the summer for his grocery supplies. It is an advantage that works both ways: The use of renovated butter creates a market for the man who produces dairy butter and affords a cheap spread to those who desire to use it.

Do not imagine that I am trying to press this matter unduly; I want to give hon. members an opportunity to say what they think about it. Those who were in favour of a cheap spread being provided when we were discussing oleomargarine should hold up both hands for this measure. I am satisfied not only as to the quality of renovated butter, but as to its food content. I could read further on in this letter a statement about the vitamines that it contains, and if half the value attaches to vitamines that the scientists claim, that consideration is a very important one, especially when comparison is made with the other cheap spread that we have discussed. I merely want to give an opportunity for an educative campaign by bringing this enactment into effect by proclamation. If the committee likes, I will incorporate in the bill a provision that the proclamation shall not issue for at least twelve months, so that the country may have an opportunity of discussing it. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) when Minister of Agriculture, brought down one of the best pieces of legislation introduced by the late government, namely, the Dairy Produce Act. That act was put into force by proclamation and the proclamation did not take place until nearly two years after the act was passed. That act met with a good deal of opposition from certain members. We are always fearful of changes in procedure which we have followed for forty years or so. It is not often I am in a position to speak in complimentary terms, not of the hon. member for Victoria City, but of the late government. I want to say to their credit, however, that they did put

this progressive legislation on the statute book, and we waited for two years before it was proclaimed law. During that time an educative campaign was carried on; the dairymen were finally ready to accept it, and you do not hear a murmur about it now. The system of grading butter and cheese as provided by that act simply glided into force, without leaving even a ripple on the surface. I am sure the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy) will corroborate what I say as to the wisdom of that procedure. So it will be with this legislation; in
4 p.m. fact, the proclamation will not issue at all if the people do not want it—I am sure I am not going to force it on them. But if they do want it after oleo goes out in March, I think it would be fair to give them the opportunity—that is all.

Mr. TOLMIE: With regard to clause 2 of this resolution, I may point out that for a number of years the manufacture or importation into Canada of renovated butter has not been permitted. During those years Canada has made greater progress in her dairying than in any other period of her history. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) in describing renovated butter. He said it was a product made from butter that contains too much salt, too much water, or too much curd—and he stopped there. The description would have been more accurate had he added, too much smell. He also said it was one hundred per cent butter fat, but he neglected to say it might be one hundred per cent rancid butter fat. If ordinary dairy butter does not have any of these objectionable features, there is no reason why it should not find a market in this country without any difficulty whatever. He speaks also about the pioneering that was done in the past, about our frontier farmers and about how we had to sell our dairy butter when there were no creameries. I remember those days very well indeed, but even then we had people who made butter of first-class quality in the dairies, and others who turned out a product that was as much butter as axle grease and commanded about the same price. I remember well the introduction of the creamery system, a step which put dairying on its feet in British Columbia. If in these outlying districts they cannot turn out a good quality of butter by the ordinary methods, then the next best thing is to encourage a co-operative creamery system. By doing that we can get away to a good start in the dairy business in these districts. A good deal of objection can be urged against the introduction of this renovated butter. There is this about oleo: It is made from fresh ingredients, under the strictest possible inspection, with sanitary conditions prevailing in the abattoirs or packing houses in which it is manufactured that do not obtain in the average dairy. It is proposed by this resolution to permit a man to make any kind of dirty butter; to keep his cream separator as dirty as he likes—to wash it once or twice a week instead of twice a day; to milk his cows with dirty hands and as a result to get dirty cream; to keep the cream too warm; to churn the butter badly, with the result that it is off in colour, in odour or in texture We propose to say to that man: Never mind; we are going to make you prosperous; we will provide a place where you can take your butter and have it deodorized so as to make it fit to eat. In my opinion it would be much better to begin with the farmer himself, to do what we can to teach him how to keep the cream; to impress upon him the necessity for cleanliness in his dairy; then, where there are three or four hundred cows in one locality, to encourage if possible the establishment of co-operative creameries. The dairyman should be taught right from the beginning that he cannot make a living out of the dairy business by milking a scrub cow and by producing a brand of butter that has to be deodorized at one of these factories before it can be sold. By following a system of that kind we can help to put the dairying of Canada on a much firmer basis than by any such proposal as is offered in clause 2 of this resolution.

Now, what is butter? According to United States law and the regulations governing its manufacture, butter is a food product made exclusively from milk or cream with or without salt or colouring matter. Renovated butter is described as butter which is subjected to any process by which it is melted, clarified or refined and made to resemble genuine butter. So you see the United States does not recognize renovated butter as genuine butter. In the United States large quantities of adulterated butter are manufactured; and I notice that the hon. minister has not referred to this in his resolution. The United States Government defines adulterated butter to mean a grade of butter produced by mixing, re-working, re-churning in milk or cream, refining or in any way producing a uniform, purified, or improved product from different lots or parcels of melted or unmelted butter or butter fat in which any acid, alkali, chemical, or any substance whatever is introduced or used for

the purpose or with the effect of deodorizing or removing therefrom rancidity; or any butter or butter fat with which there is mixed any substance foreign to butter as herein defined with intention or effect of cheapening in cost the product; or any butter in the manufacture or manipulation of which any process or material is used with intent or effect of causing the absorption of abnormal quantities of water, milk or cream. In the United States special taxes are applied to these products. On renovated butter there is a tax of a quarter of a cent per pound, and on adulterated butter a tax of ten cents per pound. Now, the general practice followed in renovating butter is to melt it at a temperature of fifty or sixty degrees. I wish to draw attention to this fact: That by melting at that low temperature you do not obtain any of the effects you might look for in properly pasteurized cream or milk, so that any germ contained in that butter may still remain. The water is separated from the oils that have been melted and then the impurities, the soluble impurities are washed out with clean water. Then it is aerated to remove the bad odors. After being laundered in this method it has neither taste, nor colour, nor odor, and to make it taste like butter it is necessary to restore its granular texture. This is done by spraying the liquid with ice cold water. Then butter colour is added to make it look like June butter. Finally the lactic sharp flavour which is so much in demand in good butter by adding a starter, or in other words lactic acid bacteria. Then the product is rolled out and worked in the ordinary way. It has been shown, though, that an oxidization takes place in this bleaching process. You will remember that in the oleo discussion it was brought out that the absence of vitamines was indicated very largely by the colour of butter; that the white winter butter was very low in vitamine content, while the June grass butter was highly yellow in colour indicating a richness of vitamines. So when this butter is washed out and bleached in this laundering process I have just described it has been lowered in vitamine content to a considerable extent. It therefore has not the same food value that ordinary butter would have. But, dressed up as it is in its new clothes, with a new smell, a new colour and so forth, it is quite suitable for fooling the public as far as butter buying is concerned. Then it has been shown not to be a good keeper. Professor Clayton, Master of Science, of Liverpool University, says:

[Mr. Tolmie.]

Cleanliness is most essential at every stage during renovation and even then the keeping qualities of the product are much inferior to those of ordinary butter.

Showing you how necessary it will be, if renovated butter is allowed to be produced in this country, to carefully guard against its being mixed with any product which we export to the Old Country.

In my opinion the legislation proposed is a retrograde step. As I pointed out a while ago the dairyman who has a cow perhaps that is giving 125 pounds of butter fat a year, is being jollied into the belief that he can continue to make butter in a creamery in which his cream is carelessly kept, whilst his cow is housed in a dirty stable in winter, he is to be permitted to send the product down to the butter laundry where it will be deodorized and sold to the people. I do not think we should do anything of that kind. The sooner this man is informed that he cannot hope to carry on dairying successfully either with a scrub cow, or with such scrub methods on his dairy farm, the better it will be for him and for the dairy interests of Canada. In fact the government will be doing him a special favour to inform him on that point. There is nothing in this proposition for the farmer as far as I can see. The average dairy cow of Canada will yield from 125 to 150 pounds of butter fat in the year. Let us say, to give her the benefit of the doubt, she averaged 150 pounds and that her lactation period lasts 300 days. This would give her average as half a pound of butter fat per day. This bad butter, I understand, sells at from ten to thirteen cents a pound according to smell and appearance. We will give the benefit of the doubt again and allow twenty cents as the average for the year. That would be a return of just ten cents per day per cow for that farmer, and perhaps that butter needs deodorizing before it can be sold. Anyone will see that this is a hopeless proposition; it will benefit somebody. The man who operates that factory will buy this butter just as cheaply as he can, will put it through this renovating process, and then sell it at a fairly good price. It will also be a benefit to the butter speculator who will buy a certain quantity of butter when it is cheap, place it in cold storage, and then wait for a rise in the market. Quite frequently that butter goes off colour and goes off in condition, and if there is a renovating factory in the country he can always send the product down to the laundry, have it done over, and then serve it up again. This is decidedly unfair to the maker of good butter in Canada—to the man who keeps

a good herd of cattle, who is careful about his dairying methods, who observes cleanliness in the care of his separators, and milking utensils and milking operations. It is particularly unfair to the producer of butter in British Columbia where we have a fine creamery system established for a long time and which has rendered very excellent service to the dairy business. In addition to making butter of very excellent quality in British Columbia we are also importers; we bring in hundreds of tons of butter from outside points into that province to supply the wants of the people there. Therefore, if renovated butter is permitted then the British Columbia producer of good butter will have to compete with this much cheaper and inferior article. There is also a very great danger, as the minister has pointed out, of mixing this renovated butter with our export butter for the Old Country. I should just like to quote what has happened in the United States in this regard. I quote again from "The Butter Industry in the United States," page 157:

> The amount of butter exported from this country has decreased considerably since 1890, when nearly 30 million pounds were exported. In 1914 the amount exported was less than 4 million pounds. This decline is due to several causes. With the appearance of oleomargarine and renovated butter large quantities of this stock were sent abroad marked as finest American creamery butter. This deception soon destroyed our reputation for making good butter, just as our reputation for making good cheese was lost by exporting adulterated and filled cheese.

Let me quote the Dairy and Food Commissioner of Michigan. In a report which deals with renovated butter he says:

> One can scarcely conceive how the ill-made and spoilt country butter, after lying for weeks in the hot storeroom of the country merchants and becoming positively nauseating, can be worked over and made sufficiently deceiving as to be sold for creamery butter. The fact remains that that is done, and in Michigan, at least, tons of this worked-over renovated butter are sold for good butter with greater or less deceit.

Now, with regard to the mixing of oleo with butter, the test for oleo is very similar to the test for this renovated or process butter, making it easy to find oleomargarine when it is added to creamery butter for the purpose of fraud, but being rather more difficult to discover whether any process or renovated butter has been added to the good article. Mixing this inferior butter with the good article which we propose to send over from Canada to Great Britain would have a tremendous effect on our British market, if we are going to get any hold on that market. With regard to the proposal to import this inferior butter from the United States, I think this is nothing short of outrageous. Why should we furnish a market in this country for this outcast material from the country south of the line? We are about twenty years behind the times, too, in our move to introduce renovated butter into Canada. Let us see what has happened in the United States. In the year 1903, 54,658,790 pounds of renovated butter was made in the United States, and in the year 1921 this had decreased to 6,099,110, or a decrease of something over almost 90 per cent. In the meantime creamery butter has increased very considerably. To meet the situation of this man on the outskirts, who is situated in the newer provinces, distant from the market, my idea would be to instruct him as fully as possible, perhaps in co-operation with the provincial government, giving him full knowledge of the necessity of having the right kind of cow in his dairy and of dairying along the proper lines. This can be done through the Farmers' Institutes. It was done that way in British Columbia. I had to do with the organization of several creameries in that country, and I was working on institute work for the provincial government. It can be done through our printed matter, which is turned out by the Department of Agriculture in very large quantity every year, and it is very excellent matter. The encouragement of the establishment of co-operative creameries, the buying of the cream on grade, and then the full education of the farmer to the fact that if he wishes to succeed—and I stress this many times over—he must get the right kind of cow, and produce the turned-out products that will promise to him the largest possible price. Every one of us who has had any experience in the dairy business knows that we must get the highest price by producing the highest priced article, if we ever hope to succeed, which means that we must work 365 days each year. We should do everything possible to develop our export market, and I do not know what effect, with our butter, perhaps, falling back a little on the British market, it will have to advise the Britishers over there that we have now taken up the renovated butter making in Canada —something we never did before. I am sure it will not improve our position. I think we should turn out the best possible article, inspect the butter very very carefully, and add, as I have proposed "Canada approved," such as we have attached to many of our agricultural products in this country, as an indication that we stand behind the goods. I think it is very regrettable that the hon. minister has brought this important resolution before the House at this late date. We are very short of information.

What I would like to know before coming to any final decision on this matter is: What proportion of the 240,000,000 pounds of butter manufactured in Canada last year was it necessary to find a market for in this country, and what proportion of that butter that has to be marketed was in such bad condition that it would require renovating before being sold? Then again what proportion, if any of this butter that is not fit for use comes from our creamery establishments? With this information and other information at hand, we would be in a very much better position to go into this matter in an intelligent way, and I sincerely hope the hon. minister will kindly consider postponing this part of the resolution until next year, when the matter can be brought up early and we will have plenty of time to get the information.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend has made the very best of what I think is not a very good case. I cannot help feeling some sympathy with the phase of the situation he suggested, namely, not dealing with it at the present time. That is exactly what the resolution does. We are not taking action at once. We are asking power to take action by proclamation. We can insert in the proviso that that proclamation will not issue until twelve months have elapsed, to afford an opportunity to discuss it in the House or in the country or next session, or if the committee thinks otherwise exclude it altogether. I will run over some of the objections raised by my hon. friend. He has raised a lot of objections, some of them very ingenious, and I have to compliment him on his remarks. He refers to the butter, and says that the chief characteristic is too much smell. Of course, it has a bad smell. Anything that you let deteriorate has a bad smell. My hon. friend has spoken about the cream this year that goes to some of our centralized creameries standing around until the top is blown off the can. Of course that would produce one of the most objectionable odours you could get—

Mr. FORKE: No, it is pungent, but not disagreeable.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a matter of taste.

Mr. FORKE: No, it is a matter of smell.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is a question of neglecting it. I wonder how eggs would smell if not put in cold storage and if let lie around like butter. We all know the story of the dairy butter; after you have supplied the home markets, it is taken to the store and the store accepts it, reluctantly as a rule, and usually trades it off. They accept it in exchange for goods. They have not enough of it to make a small shipment. It takes ten days or two weeks to accumulate enough for a shipment and it is not in cold storage during that time, it is usually in the warehouse where conditions are not favourable for it; and it is sent down to some wholesale produce dealer, perhaps in Edmonton, Winnipeg or Regina. It is accumulated in carload lots and sent out to the country. What can we expect it to be like? It must have a certain amount of odour. Use creamery butter in the same way, and what would it smell like? Use any article, the finest food in the country, in this way and what would it smell like? You can get a bad smell very easily. You can get it sometimes off the breath of very healthy people and you would not like to annihilate them or banish them from the country because of the odour. Lack of care will develop this smell in any food product so that there is nothing in that argument, except a rather clever presentation that does not really go very far, because it applies to anything which is neglected and there is sometimes the grossest kind of neglect in the handling of the dairy products of Canada. What are we going to do with this material? That is the proposition. Can we make any better use of it?

My hon. friend speaks of permitting this, or encouraging this. We are not encouraging it. We are dealing with a question that is unavoidable. There will always be a frontier in Canada for the next hundred years, or maybe longer. I have known of this for fifty or sixty years. My father before me was for seventy-five years experiencing frontier conditions, and the men who follow us will experience them. Can we take care of this matter? It is not encouraging dirt. The finest creamery butter in the world has dirt in it. It is said that the people of the city of New York eat a ton of manure every year. That is unavoidable. You cannot avoid some dirt in the finest creamery butter or milk. I am calling things by their names, and before I am done, I have a few more names to deal with. My good friend cannot get away from oleomargarine. We are not exactly dealing with oleomargarine.

Mr. FORKE: We are going to deal with it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It has been brought up. The hon. member for Battleford (Mr. McConica) in his very excellent address on oleomargarine, took the ground that he did not want it because he did not know what it was. The ground was well taken. Hon. members and the people do not know what is in it, and if they did, they would not want to eat it. What is oleomargarine? Home-

made oleomargarine is nothing more than ordinary gut fat, such as we used to make, and still make, soap out of. The leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) knows that.

Mr. TOLMIE: Would the minister kindly define "gut fat"?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is not kidney fat at all events. Gut fat is any fat that may be found on the alimentary canal from the esophagus to the rectum.

Mr. TOLMIE: That is just according to the minister's definition, but that is not generally accepted. Oleomargarine is manufactured from the caul and ruffle fats, good, clean, healthy fats, and they are recognized as edible fats. There are edible and non-edible fats. The edible fats are those that are generally defined as those that are obtained without real danger of becoming contaminated by the breaking of the intestines. These fats, I may say, are just as wholesome as any part of the muscle adjoining them, or any other part of the viscera, such as the liver, heart, and so on.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are plenty of things that you can get from the animal that are clean, that you would not want to eat. The fat that oleomargarine is made of is not kidney fat. The fats are to be found on any part of the abdominal duct or the alimentary canal, or anything you choose to call it, the stomach and the caul go into it with the rest. I have taken this fat off animals when I was a young man, and I know exactly what it is. I know the source from which it is got. When my hon. friend was describing the beauties of this article the other day, he spoke of it as "selected." To what extent is it selected? If one of the intestines breaks, it is selected from the rest, and that is the extent of the selection. None of the kidney fat goes into oleomargarine, except in one particular, and I will describe that, seeing that we are discussing this—

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is out of order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am, but I did not raise this question.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, the minister did.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friends have had enough of the ingredients of oleomargarine, and we will leave the rest for a future date, if that is desirable.

Mr. TOLMIE: I want to say that all this is absolutely selected under the close supervision of the minister's employees.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Of course it is.

Mr. TOLMIE: And they are just as good inspectors as are to be found in any other country in the world. Their certificates are accepted in other countries. The minister says that if an intestine breaks, that passes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, I said if it does, that is selected. I have had one of my chief inspectors come to my office voluntarily and tell me exactly what goes into oleomargarine. He is the one that knows, because he supervises the process, he stands over the cauldron.

Mr. TOLMIE: I have dissected these animals from one end to the other, and I have seen the work of the inspectors.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I said that when an intestine breaks, it is selected out. That is the selection. You would not have it remain in.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know whether I am in order or not, but from the minister's remarks, one would imagine that oleomargarine was past and gone, buried forever.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say that.

Mr. FORKE: I want to point out that the question stands now entirely on its merits. It is not settled.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Certainly.

Mr. FORKE: Some day the decision will have to be made for or against oleomargarine.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Certainly.

Mr. FORKE: The minister was very clever during the debate on oleomargarine, but we shall get even with him yet.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not speak at all on the oleomargarine debate. That was not necessary.

Mr. FORKE: I am not making insinuations of an unpleasant character at all. I do not mean that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not take it that way. I did not make a speech on the question of oleomargarine when the matter was up this session. A year ago I did, and I then gave a promise that an opportunity would be given to the committee to discuss the question of renovated butter. I am carrying that out. Apart from that, there is a very decided merit in connection with the question of renovated butter. Let me continue my remarks, because my hon. friend has made a number of very interesting statements, and I think they require a little investigation and examination.

My hon. friend said that I did not refer to re-churning. I did not—I did not refer

to a number of things; I thought everybody knew that renovated butter is re-churned. I knew that in the old days, and even to-day a farmer who puts away a tub of butter in the fall, or even in the spring of the year, for his own use, quite frequently has some of that butter left over when the next freshening season comes around. When he makes new butter—I do not know whether this is done now, but it was done—the old butter is cut into small particles, and it is churned up with the first new churning just as the cream is breaking into butter. The whole thing is mixed together. That is exactly the process which we are speaking of now in connection with renovated butter, with the additional advantage that it is melted in the factory, and it was not melted in the home.

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend commend the practice?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not for sale, but if a farmer chooses to use up the last twenty or thirty pounds of old butter by re-churning it —and that is the very essence of renovation— and he uses it at home, that is his own business. My hon. friend displays his whole ignorance of home practice. This is being done yet.

Mr. STEVENS: Not so much now.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is perfectly correct for them to do that. Why should they waste butter?

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend approve the practice?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not for the market.

An hon. MEMBER: What for?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: For home use.

Mr. STEVENS: How does the minister know this is done?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I know it is done. How do I know my hon. friend does not know anything about the matter? Because that is so apparent. It is spoken of as having no taste and colour. It has both. How could it be sold for export if it had neither taste nor colour? I want to reassure the committee that I am merely trying to search out for some more excellent method of getting a cheap spread for the poor man's bread than we have had yet. If we cannot find one, we shall have to do without it. As regards the yellow in oleomargarine, do hon. members know what the yellow comes from? It comes from the kidney that is in the old dairy cow that is made into canners and cutters. It is the skeleton of where fat used to be on the kidney, but this is dried up and there is just the skin to it. The marrow out of the old dairy cow is shot into the oleomargarine, and that gives the yellow colour and the appearance of vitamines. That information came directly from the chief inspector of the Health department, whom my hon. friend considers as good authority and the information was not asked for but was given voluntarily.

Mr. FORKE: May I interject that I am going to be a vegetarian from this day on.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have to make a choice between two things that are not first-class; we have to take the thing that is nearest to first-class. I am not advocating renovating butter on the ground that it is as good as creamery butter. It is a second-rate article. Do we not have second-rate wheat, third-rate wheat? Would you depreciate that as an article of diet because it is not all first-class? That is nonsense. The letter which I read a few moments ago indicates that the essential fats are all in renovated butter. That, I think, is as good an authority as has been produced yet.

Then it is said that this is good to fool the public. It is not good to fool the public, for everyone knows what it is; and at all events, whatever it may taste like, it is certainly butter. It is not an aggregation of intestinal attachments coming from those questionable places where they produce soap grease. I do not believe our people deserve to be fed on that sort of thing even if they are poor. If hon. gentlemen want to revive the question of oleomargarine I can discuss it at any time with them. In the meantime I must impress upon the committee the fact that the charge is wholly unfounded, if anyone does make it, that this article is not wholesome. The further statement is made that renovated butter is not a good "keeper." Well, that is true. When you make anything of this nature you cannot expect that it will keep for any length of time, for the simple reason that the fibre of it, if I may use that term, is destroyed. Nor does anybody seriously suggest that it is a good keeper; it is not recognized as such; it must be used as quickly as possible, for it is not intended to keep. It has been rancid, and we know perfectly well that once any foodstuff becomes rancid, while you may be able to restore it to its original state for a time, it unquestionably will not keep. This product is decreasing in quantity in the United States and they are coming to Canada for it. I want the committee therefore to know as

much about the matter as does my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie), my hon friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) or any other hon. gentleman who undertakes to speak about it.

We are told that this is a retrograde step. To the superficial it may seem a retrograde step to manufacture an article that was formerly banished from the country. But the question has been forced upon us as a result of the war: can we possibly find a cheaper spread for the poor man's bread than creamery butter? That is the issue we have to settle. We never had to consider it before the war because creamery butter has always seemed to be more or less within the reach of all. And inasmuch as we have always had a frontier people in Canada, in most of the provinces except the Maritime country, whose frontier is the sea, we must recognize the fact that there are places where the people cannot have access to creameries, so that the manufacture of this product under proper conditions should not be prevented.

The suggestion is made that the manufacture of renovated butter will encourage dirt, and that the product will have to be sent to the butter laundry. How will it encourage dirt? I should like to know. Let me inform the committee that some of our best butter makers are frontier people. The difficulty consists simply and solely in the lack of facilities for making the best butter that will keep; and if the very best creamery butter made in Canada were subjected to the same conditions, in regard to temperature, as a good deal of renovated butter is, you would have the same results. This, I think, is a libel on the makers of dairy butter themselves. Very often these people have not the proper facilities; they have no ice, nor have they any milk house. They have to get along in the best way they can, and the trouble does not lie in the fact that scrub cows are kept for dairy purposes. Scrub cows have nothing whatever to do with the matter.

Mr. TOLMIE: I never suggested for one moment that you could not make good butter from a scrub cow. What I said was that you could not make butter profitably from that kind of cow. I pointed out clearly that it was possible to make good dairy butter in the country with the facilities generally found, but that the trouble was due to carelessness on the part of the butter makers. Sometimes you find two butter makers side by side, one making good butter and the other a product that is little better than axle grease, the difference being entirely in the care or the lack of care as the case may be. I was an inspector under the provincial government for a number of years and I ought to have a fair idea of the situation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I say that the scrub cow should not be introduced into the subject at all. For that matter there is no reason why a scrub cow may not give good milk, though it may be little in quantity. If it is healthy and free from tuberculosis it should be able to produce milk with a fair percentage of butter fat. Renovated butter is described as being worth so much. I indicated a little while ago the most recent price, which was quoted at 34 cents in Chicago; and the fact that it was only 6 cents lower than the price quoted for creamery butter seems to me to show that there could not have been very much wrong with the smell of it.

It is stated that the manufacture of this article is going to benefit the factories. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is ready to admit that someone will be benefited. But, we are told, the frontier people will be gouged. Now, how can anybody say that the factory people, in the manufacture of renovated butter, will gouge anyone to any greater extent than they are gouged at present? There will not be any superfluity of renovated butter factories because the number will be limited by license; and a thorough system of inspection will ensure that the product is properly made, so that no deleterious compound will be allowed to enter into its composition. The fact is that these are all imaginary difficulties that are suggested to make the best possible case against the product; and the same arguments would hold with reference to anything else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had some more notes of what has been said but I cannot put my hand on them; evidently they are so bad that they thought it best to hide themselves. No wonder, because they were so ridiculous that they were not worth talking about. The question of importation, however, is one that we might discuss. It is one thing to take care of poor butter made on the Canadian frontier, but it is ridiculous to worry very much about the foreign article, because none of it is going to come in over a 4-cent tariff wall that is raised against ordinary butter. The United States people want our butter; it is not we who want theirs, because our butter is going into that country over an 8-cent barrier. It is simply impossible for imported butter to come from the United States into Canada. But even if it did come in, what would you do? Would you suggest putting an embargo against it? I have

thought the matter out, and such a course I cannot countenance for a moment. If there were a possibility of butter coming from the United States I would discuss the matter with my colleagues, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to see what practical steps could be taken to meet the situation. But we do not want to put on an embargo; we do not want to do anything unfriendly. And the fact is that an embargo is not necessary under the present market conditions. We have discussed on previous occasions the undesirability of embargoes in reference to coal, pulpwood, and one thing and another, and anything of that character should be considered with exceeding care before being proposed and internationally discussed.

Let me say once more that the quality of this class of butter depends upon the care that is taken of it. Originally a great bulk of this butter was quite edible and good; but it is made under such primitive conditions in the matters of temperature, salt and facilities for keeping it, that there is a danger of its becoming bad soon after manufacture. The drawback is the lack of cold storage facilities; and many people have no milk houses, so that the keeping properties of the product are not very good, and it is apt to get rancid if it is delayed too long a time in transportation. Notwithstanding all these things, however, renovated butter has been found to be a good article of diet, as is shown by the very fact that the price is only 6 or 7 cents lower than that of creamery butter.

I am the last one on earth to advocate anything that would put our dairy industry in jeopardy. In the short time I have been in office I have done everything possible with the money at my disposal to get a new stride on our dairy industry. One of the first steps has been to get rid of these spurious substitutes masquerading as real dairy products. If the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) were here, I am sure I would have a valiant champion of this resolution with respect to filled milk and filled cream. These are prohibited, as is also the filling of butter with foreign fats. The whole tenor of the measure I have introduced in the last two years has been to aid the dairy industry of Canada. If the provision of renovated butter for the poor man's spread is going to jeopardize the dairy industry to any extent, we will have to seek some other solution; because Canada will have to depend on its dairy industry as the cornerstone of agriculture.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. CARROLL: We have had many kinds of butter offered for sale in this country, some bad, some good, but the name of the latest variety, renovated butter, is more or less misleading it seems to me. In the old days a class of people went around the country collecting old rags and bottles. My hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is developing a new industry, for in a few days, if this bill passes, we shall see another class of people going around our backwards calling for old dairy butter. Then after they have renovated this rancid butter the minister says it is good enough for the Canadian people.

Renovated butter and oleomargarine were dealt with by the Privy Council during the war. For some reason, good, bad or indifferent, those who had control of our dairy interests in those days refused to have anything at all to do with renovated or adulterated butter, but they did suggest that as a war measure we should allow the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. In the United States renovated butter is described as:

> 22 Butter which has been subjected to any process by which it is melted, clarified and refined and made to resemble genuine butter, always excepting adulterated butter.

A few days ago the minister took very strong exception to oleomargarine because it was made to resemble butter. But the statute of the United States, which I have no doubt he is following in this matter, says very distinctly that renovated butter is melted and refined and made to resemble genuine butter. Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is butter.

Mr. CARROLL: It is rancid butter. If it was genuine butter it would not need renovation at all.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is decayed butter.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes. The minister says it is for home consumption, but he is not putting it on the market. How is he going to get it into the homes of the people if it is not marketed through some medium?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say that. Some hon. gentleman asked me how it was made. I said it was made in the farm homes to-day and used for home consumption by those who made it. It is not melted, it is cut into fine pieces and churned.

Mr. CARROLL: If it is renovated it is not genuine butter. The dairy industry in the United States has been safeguarded by the imposition of a 2 per cent tax upon renovated

butter and a 10 cents per pound tax upon adulterated butter. I read a report a few days ago to the effect that it is absolutely impossible to distinguish between renovated butter and adulterated butter. This is the definition of adulterated butter in the United States statutes:

"Adulterated butter" is hereby defined to mean a grade of butter produced by mixing, reworking, rechurning in milk or cream, refining, or in any way producing a uniform, purified, or improved product from different lots or parcels of melted or unmelted butter or butter fat, in which any acid, alkali, chemical, or any substance whatever is introduced or used for the purpose or with the effect of deodorizing or removing therefrom rancidity, or any butter or butter fat with which there is mixed any substance foreign to butter as herein defined, with intent or effect of cheapening in cost the product, or any butter in the manufacture or manipulation of which any process or material is used with intent or effect of causing the absorption of abnormal quantities of water, milk or cream.

In the United States they treat rancid butter with an acid, alkali or chemical and make it into what is called adulterated butter. My hon. friend is going to take this rancid butter —which is picked up in our back yards, and which the dairy people refuse to market—and renovate it without treating it with any acid, alkali or chemical. Butter may be renovated and be without smell or taste, as the hon. minister said. But I say it is all taste and all odour, and will so remain notwithstanding its being designated as renovated butter.

If this butter is to be allowed to be brought into the Dominion, we are likely to have another industry. At present we have the rum bootlegger, and last year we had the cigarette bootlegger. Now we are going to have the renovated butter bootlegger, who will see to it that butter renovated or adulterated in the United States is brought in here without paying any tax. My hon. friend is being led astray by the fact that there is a loud cry in Canada for a butter substitute. Renovated butter is not a butter substitute: it is a bad butter; it is a rancid butter; it is a rotten butter. If the minister can show the committee any means whereby he can renovate a butter without using an acid and thereby making it an adulterated butter, then he is a chemist for whom this country has been looking for some time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was just wondering where my hon. friend got his authority for what he says about using acids. Is there anything else in it except the lactic acid that is generated in milk or cream that is sour?

Mr. CARROLL: I am glad my hon. friend admits that degeneration takes place.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not at all.

Mr. CARROLL: Why impose upon the people something that is degenerated? If from 1914 to 1918, when the people were considering the matter of substitutes for butter and other foods, they refused to have anything to do with renovated or adulterated butter, then I cannot understand why in a time of peace, when there is no cry for substitutes, we should go back to a period that we have long since outlived. My hon. friend talks about a spread. Is he aware that the official spread for bread to-day in the British navy is oleomargarine? The British navy is developing the best athletes in the world. I do not say they are doing it on oleomargarine, but I do say that the physicians of the English navy, who are noted for their judgment and fair-mindedness, have approved of a regulation making oleomargarine the official spread for the navy's bread.

Mr. McBRIDE: We are not talking about oleomargarine now; we are debating the question of butter.

Mr. CARROLL: Well, I am talking about both. But I shall not disturb the dreams of my hon. friend very much longer. I am not a dairyman; I have not a cow and perhaps never will have one, but I have some interest in the people of this country. A week ago the minister stood in his place and opposed the manufacture and importation of a product which is recognized in the British navy as a substitute for butter. He now tells the committee that it is necessary for the poor man of this country that the manufacture and importation of renovated butter be permitted. I do suggest that in view of all the circumstances he should give the matter a little more serious consideration than he has given it.

Mr. GOOD: I have been listening very attentively to the discussion, but I have not got complete light on the situation yet. It has been stated that it is more difficult to detect renovated butter when mixed with ordinary butter than it is to detect oleomargarine when used in the same way. If that is the case, it will be difficult to prevent fraud. What means will be adopted as a protection against fraud or misrepresentation? Furthermore, in regard to the chemical changes which may be produced in butter through its being kept for long periods at a fairly high temperature, how far is it possible to remove the various products of decomposition which result from these changes? It may be fairly easy to deodorize the product to a certain extent by aeration, but it strikes me it is a very

5 p.m.

much more difficult process effectively to remove the products of decomposition. Then, I should like to know something about the question of sterilizing. It has been maintained that butter used in the manufacture of renovated butter would be not so good on the average as creamery butter. Of course, a good deal of the butter manufactured under primitive conditions is perfectly clean, or at least as clean as the average creamery butter. But I am inclined to think that the butter that will find its way into the renovating factories will be a product which has been manufactured by careless people under conditions which may bring about contamination. I do not think there is anything in the renovating process which is designed to afford protection against disease germs, and I would like to have some information on that point. It does seem to me that the minister is adopting a very extraordinary attitude after his vote the other day on the oleomargarine question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I did not speak on it the other day.

Mr. GOOD: I was not referring to the minister's speaking on it; I was referring to his voting on the question. It is not necessary on all occasions to speak to a subject in order to indicate one's attitude. I have always been of the opinion that, under proper regulation and supervision to guard against fraud and misrepresentation, oleomargarine is a perfectly suitable food product, and I sincerely hope that before the end of the present session, perhaps in connection with this bill, the House will have a chance to declare itself on this particular issue, wholly apart from the issues that entered into the discussion and the vote the other day. The minister talks about the poor man's spread. It is necessary for us to have some regard to that phase of the question, but it seems to me that this renovated butter is likely to be a poorer, a more dangerous poor man's spread than oleomargarine. I have no objections to renovated butter; in that respect I hold the same view as I do in regard to oleomargarine. I do not object to it provided that we can certify as to its quality, as to its wholesomeness, and provided also that we can protect the public against fraud and misrepresentation. Until we get more information on these points it seems to me that we are, to quote the old saying, "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel." I hope the minister can give the committee some further information on these questions. Let me repeat them again, because I think the minister was not paying attention when I started to speak.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I heard the questions.

Mr. GOOD: There is the question of misrepresentation, the question of removing the products of decomposition, and the question of sterilization.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the hon. gentleman's attitude is quite reasonable. But the resolution provides exactly what he asked for. We are not going into this matter in such a tremendous hurry. The hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) seemed to think that to-morrow or the day after the bill became law, we would be shouting renovated butter round the streets. That is not so. Here is my proposal: If the House sends this bill to the select standing committee on Agriculture my intention is to follow the same course that we have adopted in the case of three or four other bills, bring the experts of the Department of Agriculture before the committee to give evidence on the very things my hon. friend speaks about. What else can you do? You cannot bring these experts before the House. Furthermore, I am prepared to suggest now that the word "importation" be struck out from the bill. I will discuss the matter with the proper authorities and see if that can be done without doing violence to our international relations, or being accused of anything that would look like unfriendliness towards other nations. I do not like to see that word "importation" used. I will be quite frank with the House and say that the experts in the Dairy branch differ on this question. Some of them do not like it. After this has been prohibited for twenty years they do not like the idea of reintroducing it. Others take the ground that it never should have been prohibited, that it should have been permitted all along. We will submit evidence to the committee from experts, and to the extent the witnesses seem to favour a departure in the matter we will give the industry the benefit of the doubt. But let us try to get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. GOOD: Does the minister propose to submit this bill to the committee on Agriculture after its second reading?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When reference of a bill to a committee is proposed it is always done after a second reading. Any section of this bill could be eliminated in the Agriculture committee without destroying any principle embodied in it. As a matter of fact, the bill

to amend the Live Stock Act was so completely changed in committee that we had to reprint it.

Mr. GOOD: When will the bill be submitted to the committee?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Just as soon as possible. I understand we are going to have morning sittings next week so that we would have to do it on Monday.

Now, just let me run over two or three matters that have been raised during the discussion. Certain members have described the product we are dealing with. It was stated by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) that this renovated butter is so good that it is sent over to the United Kingdom from the United States and passes there for creamery butter.

An hon. MEMBER: It is mixed with other butter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, it is mixed if you like. But even so, it cannot be as bad as it has been described; you cannot fool people that way.

Mr. TOLMIE: The minister is hardly giving to what I said the interpretation I intended. What I tried to point out was that there had been so much fraudulent shipping of oleomargarine and renovated butter to Great Britain that it had caused a serious falling off in the export of American butter to that country.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But we cannot have the product so good that it is taken for creamery butter, and at the same time so bad that the smell of it is enough to knock you down. I have promised to have this bill referred to the committee on Agriculture. I believe there is a question involved that is worth looking into, and worth solving, for the purpose of meeting the dairyman's views on the one hand and the views of the man who wants cheap butter on the other. If we can do that we shall be performing a good service. Let the bill go to the committee on Agriculture, and if they feel that any section is wrong or is unwise it can be eliminated. There is nothing mysterious about that. We removed three or four sections from the bill to amend the Live Stock Act. I should like to see the word "importation" struck out and I will move that that be done now. I do not like the thought of importation, but I am not a bit afraid myself of any importation taking place. I think it is only an imaginary difficulty, something that will never arise. But even imaginary difficulties sometimes hurt more than difficulties that are real.

Mr. STEVENS: This resolution and the matter it deals with are very important. It will not do for the minister to answer a civil question put to him across the floor by a somewhat crude intimation that the questioner is ignorant of the subject he is talking about. I must say that outside of the Minister of Agriculture I think I can compliment most of the members of the government, when in committee of the whole, with at least behaving with attentive courtesy and giving civil answers to those who question them in a polite and proper manner.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is terrible.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Agriculture seldom presents anything to the House which calls for debate without making more or less of a burlesque of the whole proceedings. He has not abandoned or departed from his record in that respect this afternoon. I therefore think it would be better for me to address what observations I have to make more to the Prime Minister than to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is politeness itself.

Mr. STEVENS: My remarks have greatly to do with the propriety and desirability of advancing this legislation at this late period in the session. May I point out to the Prime Minister this: In the first place there is decided opposition to this legislation in the country. I have in my hand a telegram from the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association. This association consists of 1,800 farmers in the Fraser valley who have banded themselves together for the marketing of their products, that is milk, butter and other products. It markets its products direct to the consumer, and perhaps is one of the best and most highly organized co-operative associations in existence in Canada. The telegram reads as follows:

> We understand that resolution is being introduced in parliament permitting the importation, manufacture and sale of renovated butter. We strongly protest against the government granting such permission. Same will be very detrimental to the dairy interests of this country.

I submit this to the Prime Minister. I have already submitted it to the Minister of Agriculture and I think it would perhaps add to the burlesquing of this matter if I read the minister's letter to the House.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend read his own letter as well?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, if it is desirable.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my answer is read I should like my hon. friend to read his letter to me.

Mr. STEVENS: I will read them both.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Sure.

Mr. STEVENS: I have received another telegram from George Sangster, on behalf of the Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association, incorporated in which are, perhaps, the main dairymen and producers of Vancouver Island. The telegram reads as follows:

Milk producers of Vancouver Island absolutely opposed to resolution to permit importation, manufacture and sale of renovated butter. Please use every effort to defeat this measure as we consider it would impose unfair and impossible competition and deal a death blow to the dairy industry.

Here are two large associations—and I submit this to the Prime Minister in particular—I suppose numbering upwards of 3,000 members, of dairymen, with mostly large herds, 20, 30, 40, or 50 head of cattle, all marketing their products directly to the people, and both these associations declaring that this measure is very very detrimental. On this request I base my argument. This product has been barred from the Canadian market for 20 years. Why, within one week of the end of the session, introduce legislation to permit the manufacture of this product in Canada—I shall deal with the proclamation feature later—without giving opportunity to such interests as these to whom I have referred—and doubtless there are other interests in other parts of Canada—a fair opportunity to be heard before the committee on Agriculture? It will be at once recognized by this committee that there is no possibility whatever of the dairy interests of Canada being heard next Monday morning. That is an absurdity. It is only an evidence of the insincerity of the minister and the deliberate desire on his part to rush this measure through, not only without due consideration, but without a remnant of fairness to the industries so vitally interested.

Mr. NEILL: Did these two large dairying interests in British Columbia not make similar representations against oleo, which the hon. member ignored?

Mr. STEVENS: Not to me. I am merely reading what I have received. I admit, with reference to the mild indictment of my hon. friend that, perhaps, I am not as well posted, or as well qualified, to speak on this question, as some hon. members. I see across the way my hon. friend from Fraser Valley (Mr. Munro) who, I know, is well qualified to speak. He represents one of the best dairying districts in Canada, but, on the other hand, let me say to the minister that I am not altogether void of knowledge of the dairy business. I spent a great many years in my early days on an Ontario farm, and I have been interested in western farming for the last ten years. I do not parade that fact, because I think it is inadvisable for one who is not actually and definitely a farmer to emphasize the fact that he knows something about farming. I used that fact as a retort that I am not wholly ignorant of the subject. The minister challenged me to read my letter to him and his letter to me. I will do so. My letter to him is dated June 18, and reads:

OTTAWA, June 18th, 1923.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. MOTHERWELL,

I enclose herewith two telegrams from the Vancouver Independent Milk Producers' Association and the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, Vancouver, objecting to your bill to provide for the manufacture and sale of "renovated" butter.

I beg to advise you that it is my intention when this matter comes before the House, to urge for the withdrawal of this bill for this session and suggest the submission of the whole subject to the Agricultural committee next year. I see no reason for haste in the passing of such legislation and, furthermore, I most respectfully submit that your action in promoting this bill is wholly inconsistent with the attitude you took, as Minister of Agriculture, in recently opposing the manufacture and sale of a perfectly wholesome food, namely, oleomargarine.

You undoubtedly know that in the process of manufacturing so called renovated butter deleterious chemicals are used and I am amazed that you, as Minister of Agriculture, would be so indifferent to the creamery and dairy interests of this country as to introduce such a bill.

I therefore earnestly suggest that you withdraw this bill for this session and refer the whole question to the Agricultural committee next session.

Yours very sincerely,
H. H. STEVENS.

That is the letter I wrote to the minister. His reply is dated June 19th, and reads:

OTTAWA, 19th June, 1923.

The Honourable H. H. STEVENS, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. STEVENS,

Your favour of the 18th instant just received.

Replying I have to thank you for your quite decided views regarding renovated butter. I may say that I have myself been endeavouring for a number of years to estimate the value of this product as a cheaper spread than creamery butter for those who do not feel they are warranted in paying the higher price.

Last year when the oleo. discussion was up I promised the House that, in the event of oleo. being prohibited, I would advise my colleagues to make legislative provision to remove the prohibition of the manufacture of renovated butter, on the ground that the fat of the latter consists of 100 per cent butter fat, contains all the essential vitamines and growth properties, and consequently would seem to be a more logical, cheap spread than ordinary gut fat, which has usually been used as soap grease in times past and even yet. However, even in a matter so obvious as this, experts seem to differ.

It is my intention to have this question discussed before the Agricultural committee—not next year but this year, when a number of authorities can be asked to give evidence in the same manner as I have done with my other bills this session.

I think you are a member of the Agricultural committee and I should be very pleased to have the benefit of your advice and suggestions when the matter is then under discussion. I might point out also that the provision with respect to renovated butter is merely one section of a bill, the balance of which, I feel confident, will meet with your entire approval. Your suggestion, therefore, that the bill be withdrawn will, I think, be opposed by yourself when you understand all the circumstances.

Thanking you for your favour, I remain,
Yours very truly,
W. R. MOTHERWELL.

There is nothing in that of any importance, but I read it because my hon. friend desires to have it read.

Let me turn to one or two other phases of the matter. My hon. friend says he mentioned this a year ago. Now he says that one of these resolutions provides that the legislation will be ineffective for a year at least. He will promise the House that the proclamation will not be made until after next March. This is what I want the committee to consider: After mentioning this over a year ago why did the minister not introduce it early in the session and let the committee deal with it while the sittings of this House were proceeding? If, on the other hand, it was not desirable to introduce it early this year, so the committee could study it, and it is not his intention to bring the legislation into effect until after next March, why not let it stand over till next year and give the committee of Agriculture an opportunity to discuss it properly, and give the interests affected an opportuninty to appear before the committee? In order to take that stand, it is not necessary for me to be opposed to the matter on principle at all. I am merely dealing with the desirability of forcing matter through during the last days of the session. Surely, nothing will be lost by postponing this for a year, when for over twenty years there has been no such commodity produced in Canada. Who is to be hurt? The minister himself says, "If there is no demand for it"—I have his words here, because I always find it necessary to write them down, if I wish to put a question in regard to them—"the proclamation will not be made; if there is a demand we will issue the proclamation." Why not wait and delay the legislation, to see if there is a demand? Why not wait to give those affected an opportunity to express their views pro or con?

There is another matter I wish to refer to. Most able reference has been made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) who speaks on all such subjects with authority, and not only with authority, but with ability, and in a manner becoming the dignity of the House. He referred to the fact that the whole effort of the agricultural departments of the provinces and the Dominion in connection with the pure foods administration of the country has been pressing towards making a highclass product, and obtaining better methods of dairying and creamery butter production, and he pointed out that one of the effects of encouraging the use of renovated butter was to encourage the reproduction of inferior or carelessly made butter. The minister said that butter would deteriorate. He said "It will get rotten and does get rotten." He also said, "If you expose eggs to the weather, to the sun and the warm temperature, will they not get rotten?" But is the minister proposing next session to bring in a measure for renovated eggs—to make rotten eggs marketable? That is the next thing we shall hear about from the Minister of Agriculture. As I listened to the minister this afternoon going through that effort to ridicule the splendid and scientific presentation of this question by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), I thought his indictment of the dairy industry of this country was one of the most damning that I had ever heard. If anyone took seriously the utterances of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, that the butter products of this country were produced as he intimated they were, that the slaughtering of animals and the extraction of the various parts were carried out in the manner he described, that would be one of the most injurious things to the dairying industry and the butter production industry of Canada.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What has the slaughtering of animals to do with the dairy industry?

Mr. STEVENS: I wondered myself when my hon. friend pictured, in a somewhat disgusting fashion, the puncturing of the intestines of an animal.

Mr. FORKE: I would suggest that this argument is getting a little rotten.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was not talking about butter then.

Mr. STEVENS: The presentation by the minister of the case from his standpoint this afternoon was not in the interest of the promotion of the production of butter in this country.

Mr. McBRIDE: Is the president or the manager of this Fraser Valley Milk Association the same person who, when the question of reducing the price of milk in Vancouver was up, said: "To hell with the public"?

Mr. STEVENS: I do not remember the incident mentioned by my hon. friend, nor do I know. I do not quite see the pertinence of the question. All I know is this—and I know this from personal acquaintance with many of them—that the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association is what I said it was, namely a combination of some 1,800 farmers, dairymen, producing milk, marketing it directly to the people of Vancouver, New Westminster and other centres, and manufacturing very large quantities of butter. Outside of that I know nothing more of what the president may have said in a fit of temper or may not have said.

While the minister may accuse me of ignorance of some matters which may seem to be very familiar to him, I, at least, as a public man, or as a private citizen, ought to have some interest in the promotion of the dairying business and the foreign trade of Canada. One of the things we have been striving as a nation to do for the last twenty years is to raise the general standard of our products, to bring these products to such a uniformity of standard that they will earn a place on the British or European market in competition with the highly developed dairy industry of Denmark. In the very interesting booklets sent to me day after day by the minister—and if the minister issues these booklets, surely he expects us to read them—I was reading an indictment of the Canadian dairy industry to a certain extent on the very point that they were not keeping up the standard of uniformity of butter in Canada in competition with Denmark. Within a week they showed us figures that the Denmark exportation to the British market had increased enormously, while the Canadian exportation had decreased. That is something in which I am interested, and I do not intend to be silenced by the rebuff from the minister that I am supposed to know nothing about the subject. I am not speaking dogmatically, but many feel that the introduction of this resolution as regards the production of renovated butter in Canada on a large scale, will tend to lower the general standard of Canadian butter produced for export. Let me tell the committee why. We know perfectly well that renovated butter is deodorized; the objectionable visible features, shall I say, are taken out of it, that is the question of odour and the question of bad taste, by certain chemical processes. It is washed in lime or lime materials and other things, and these are eliminated. When it is manufactured, as I am told by those who know and who are in a position to advise, there is, perhaps, difficulty at a glance to tell the difference between it and fairly good creamery butter, but the minute the inspector sees it, he discovers it. Take a shipment of say 60,000 cases of butter going on the London or Liverpool market, or wherever it may go. They test every one in 10 or 20, as the case may be, according to the usual method of test. It might be possible to slip into such a shipment quite a large number of cases of butter not up to standard. That has been one of the complaints against Canadian butter, that running through our Canadian butter there are at times inferior cases. What I wish to impress upon the minister, and particularly on the Prime Minister at this time, is that many of us think the introduction of this legislation will tend to vitiate the policy followed by this government and previous governments, namely of raising the standard of general dairy products. We do not wish that to be brought about. I am not saying it will, but at least let us have a reasonable time to study the question.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does my hon. friend know whether the renovation prevails in any country except the United States?

Mr. STEVENS: I am not in a position to answer that question. I would not answer it because I cannot answer it correctly and definitely. Let me say this, in conclusion: It will be utterly impossible to give a fair hearing to this matter this session before the Agricultural committee. We begin sitting in the morning next week, and we hope to get through by the end of next week. These interests, therefore, cannot be heard. I have made certain representations, very weak, on their behalf; but they and other interests cannot be heard. The minister says that he does not intend to bring this proclamation in for a year. Then why pass the legislation? Why fix upon the country a definite statutory law, when you acknowledge that you have not had time for consideration, and when it is clear that these interests cannot be heard. So I ask the Prime Minister most earnestly that this measure, as regards renovated butter, should be allowed to stand over until next year, and that all interests should be heard before the Agriculture committee. Personally I shall be glad to abide by the decision of that committee, after a reasonable and fair hearing of the subject.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister has intimated clearly that his intention is to refer the bill to the Agriculture committee. That committee is, perhaps, in a better position than the House to decide whether it would be wise to have this particular clause stand over for another year. If the committee has the slightest doubt as to the wisdom of proceeding with that clause, the government would be only too happy to accept the finding of the committee on that point. It will, perhaps, facilitate matters, seeing that we are discussing the resolution merely at the moment, if the committee were to pass the resolution and let the bill go to the Agriculture committee, with the understanding that if that committee is in the slightest doubt about the wisdom of proceeding with that particular question, the government will not press that part of the bill. Moreover, coupled with that, the members may take into account the minister's assurance that he will see that the proclamation under which this would become law, will be, at least, one year's time distant from the present, and this would give the opportunity of another session of parliament to consider the matter if it were thought advisable to do so.

Mr. STEVENS: That is really my strongest point. I wish the Prime Minister would consider it again after we pass from this stage. If you are going to consider the question in the interim between the assumed passing of the measure and the proclamation, would not it be better to consider the matter before the legislation is passed?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have had the misfortune once or twice of treading on the toes of my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). That hon. gentleman does not like my style of debate. I am sorry for that; but I seem to get along very well with it, and as it is the only kind of style I have I am afraid my hon. friend will have to put up with it, however distasteful it may be to him. He calls that style a burlesque, and strange to say he appears to think that I should accept that description with good grace. I was not very long in the House, as a matter of fact, before the hon. gentleman began to apply such descriptive phrases to myself, as "the Minister of Agriculture's burlesque." And when I modestly suggest that he does not know anything at all about dairying, why, he gets mad. I do not see why he should take umbrage at a statement so obviously true. Now, we cannot expect to give without occasionally being asked to take, in return; and surely, as a sportsman, my hon. friend should be ready to take what is coming to him, especially when it is so richly deserved as on this occasion.

Just one word or two, however. The hon. gentleman says that I have not given a civil answer. I replied to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) in the only way that I could possibly have replied to him. Sometimes such strange things are said that one can answer them only by ridicule, which, by the way, is very often the most effective method. An attempt is made at a description of chemicals. Is lactic acid a chemical? What do we usually mean when we talk of chemicals? Surely no one will describe as decomposition the natural process that takes place in the course of the manufacture of many excellent articles of diet such as bread, for example. Is there any decomposition in the manufacture of silage, or of any of those things in which certain necessary bacterial action takes place? If the decomposition which takes place in the manufacture of these things were the harmful process which hon. gentlemen seem to suggest, then some of the finest products we have would be noxious. So that when hon. gentlemen talk about "decomposition" in the way they do they only display a lack of knowledge of which it surely is no harm to remind them. If I delved into any question involving legal technicalities hon. gentlemen would most undoubtedly be justified if they reminded me that I was discussing a subject with which I was not particularly conversant.

Mr. TOLMIE: I did not say that the putrefaction that took place was not due to bacterial action. There are four or five kinds of bacteria responsible for the changes that occur in the process of decomposition.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was replying in this instance to my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). Now, I am not trying to force this thing through, and I do not think that I have appeared to be particularly wedded to the question. I have as open a mind in regard to the matter as anyone in the committee, and I recognize that it would take a great deal of explanation to show why, after a prohibition of twenty years, the manufacture of this product should be permitted. It would be much easier for me not to introduce the subject if I wanted to take the course of least resistance. If the committee will accept the Prime Minister's suggestion, of referring the matter to the committee on Agriculture, I promise to use no more influence than my unassisted vote, if it does come to a vote, to put it through. And if there is any doubt on the part of the committee as to the wisdom of the action we propose, we will defer the question not for a day or a month only, but, so far as I am concerned at any rate,

forever. We do not want to jeopardize in the least degree the dairying industry of the country, but we do want to take care of a situation that may arise when butter suddenly runs up in price beyond the reach of poor people. If the suggestion of the Prime Minister is acceptable to the committee we will eliminate this section. There is no need for any heated controversy over the section. We will drop it and go on with the rest of the measure in the usual way.

Mr. GOOD: One serious objection to the procedure proposed by the minister is that Monday forenoon is apparently the only time the committee will have for the consideration of the matter, which is one of much importance. Moreover, the attendance in the committe on Monday will in all probability be very small, owing to the fact that the election takes place in Ontario on that day. It seems to me that the wise policy would be to defer the whole matter for a year, so far at least as this particular clause is concerned, so that we may go into the particulars of it more fully in the meantime.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I realize the situation that will exist on Monday, but inasmuch as the House will not meet next week until eleven o'clock there is no reason why the Agriculture committee could not meet at ten o'clock so that we might have a full hour for as many days as might be necessary to discuss the subject. Indeed, I do not think it would take many days to dispose of the question after the committee had heard the evidence of the experts.

Mr. GOOD: There will be practically no members from Ontario present on Monday.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am speaking of Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday.

Mr. LADNER: I do not wish to let the occasion pass without joining in the protest not only against the principle of this legislation, but more particularly against the decision of the government to introduce it at this time. All hon. members are aware that many of the representatives from the dairy districts in Ontario are at this moment engaged in other matters than agriculture, and we have not their advice on this important question. It is very apparent that few people who are really interested in this legislation have had an opportunity of presenting their case to the minister, and certainly they will have no opportunity of appearing before the committee. The Prime Minister has suggested that when the matter is before the committee the government will not press this particular part of the bill. The minister himself has stated that he has an open mind with reference to the matter and is not particularly biassed one way or the other. At least, I regard that as his attitude. This legislation has been waiting 20 years now, and parliament has been sitting for the past six months. Yet the government desires to press this matter through in six days. On what ground are they justified in endeavouring to railroad this legislation through parliament in so short a space of time? The minister himself has told us that if there is any doubt in the matter he is prepared to defer it not only for a day or a month, but forever. In other words, he expresses the willingness on the part of the government to do the fair thing by everyone interested and give the matter proper consideration. Under these circumstances, is there any reason why the whole subject, without being referred to any committee, cannot be allowed to stand over until next session in order that full justice may be done all persons interested? Large institutions like the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association are vitally interested in this matter; and this particular organization, comprising some 1,800 members, have sent me a telegram stating their point of view. The wholesale producers who deal in this product as well as the consuming public, as represented in various organizations, will also undoubtedly desire to declare their position in the matter. For my part therefore I cannot see any reason why the minister or the government should object to the reasonable request of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), which if voted on would, I am sure, be supported by the majority of the committee.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Since this subject has been on the order paper we have had no protests against the legislation apart from the telegrams that have come from British Columbia, where I am sure the people are not acquainted with the real facts of the case. From among all the members of the National Dairy Council I have not had one protest against it. However, with a view to getting into touch with some of those who are interested in the subject, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

That it is expedient to amend the Feeding Stuffs Act, chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1920, and to provide,—

1. That no person shall import into, manufacture, sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale in Canada, any flour mill by-product resulting from the cleaning and milling of wheat for the production of flour by the usual commercial processes, unless,

(a) the container or tag or label attached thereto is branded or marked as prescribed;

(b) the bran, pure shorts, middlings or feed flour are free from admixture of any foreign materials;

(c) the bran, pure shorts, shorts and mill screenings, middlings or feed flour meet the requirements as to protein and fat content, fineness and quality established by the regulations, and contain no crude fibre in excess of the percentage by weight as prescribed;

(d) the shorts and mill screenings are first registered as a commercial feeding stuff and contain not more than the mill run of screenings and scourings removed from the wheat from which shorts was obtained.

2. That no person shall manufacture pure shorts and shorts and mill screenings at the same mill.

3. That the sale in Canada, or the importation, of any feeding stuff found to be adulterated or incorrectly or misleadingly tagged, labelled or named, shall be a violation of the act, and the minister may cancel any registration and prohibit the further sale or importation of any such feeding stuff.

Mr. ROBB: Section 2 provides:

That no person shall manufacture pure shorts and shorts and mill screenings at the same mill.

It occurs to me that if this were put into force every mill in Canada would have to go out of business.

Mr. STEVENS: It is rather interesting to hear the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb). I was anxious to learn his views on the resolution. As far as I know, there should not be very great objection to the main idea behind this proposed legislation, but I do not want to appear to commit myself and others here to the principle in detail when we come to the bill, because I see there is some difference between the bill and the resolution, the details being more clearly set forth in the former.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think it might be well to explain how these amendments came to be proposed. As the committee are aware, the adulterating of mill by-products with screenings has been authorized by law during the last few years. A number of complaints have been made to the department, particularly by farmers, as to the bad effect that some of these mill feeds containing screenings has on young pigs, the deaths of a number of animals being attributed to such feeds. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) brought the matter to my attention some time ago, and I promised to bring down legislation to deal with the trouble. Before doing so I thought it well to consult the advisory board which the Seed Control Act provides for. This board represents the milling, live stock, dealers and other interests concerned. It met in this city and this bill is the result of their cogitations. The very section the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) calls attention to is a compromise. Mr. Cornell, secretary of the National Millers' Association, and Mr. Watts, secretary of the Dominion Millers' Association, were present, and they, on behalf of the milling interests, accepted this as a compromise. Middlings have to be sold in their purity because this is the only article that can be fed to young pigs, there being too much fibre in bran for them to assimilate. The millers take the ground that inasmuch as we compel them to sell middlings and bran in a pure state they should be allowed to make some disposition of the screenings the farmers sell with the wheat. They suggest that they be permitted to mix shorts with screenings as a feed for dairy cattle, to whom it would not be deleterious. Shorts is simply fine bran.

Mr. LOVIE: The millers pay nothing for the screenings, which really belong to the farmer, being treated as dockage. What right, therefore, have the millers to mix these screenings and sell them as cattle feed?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not pleading that the millers have any right to do so. I am simply pointing out that several interests are involved in this matter and that after discussing it for two or three days this resolution was the compromise they reached. I appreciate the point raised by my hon. friend, but the fact remains that screenings do get into wheat to a certain extent and are paid for as wheat.

Mr. GOULD: Were the western millers represented in the conference?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Watts and Mr. Cornell between them represented the organized millers of Canada. I expected that the question would be raised, because there was a feeling of resentment against mixing these products at all. Inasmuch as a certain amount of dairy feed is required, it is suggested that screenings should be mixed with shorts for the purpose. I should like to have the views of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) and the hon. member for Glengarry and Stormont (Mr. Kennedy), both of whom I understand have had a good deal of experience in dairying. There was a three day discussion on this somewhat involved question—the advisory board is there for this very purpose—and it does seem to be a fair compromise. It is

now provided that you cannot put any of these things into this mill stuff, even after you have bought it from the farmers and paid for it.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I would like to commend the minister for the main principle involved in this resolution. When the Feeding Stuffs bill was introduced in 1920 I took occasion to suggest to the then Minister of Agriculture that he provide in his bill that bran, pure shorts, middlings and those feeds that are generally looked upon as standard feeds be sold in their pure state. The bill which was passed at that time contemplated the mixing of screenings and other things with those feeds. I was glad to see the minister bring down a measure for the purpose of ensuring that these feeds particularly should be sold in their pure state, but I am a little sorry to see him weakening to the extent of suggesting that he does not care about the rest so long as middlings are sold in their pure state. That principle is just as important in its application to bran and shorts as it is in its application to middlings.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend think it makes the shorts a less desirable dairy feed if the screenings are ground and mixed with it? I am not too sure about that myself. If they are good screenings, the result is an excellent feed, but I admit that it depends on the nature of the screenings. Shorts is only fine bran; there is very little middlings in it.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): The mixing of screenings with shorts or bran or any of the feeds specified in this resolution will certainly lower their feeding value. If a miller wishes to compound a feed or to make a feed out of the screenings he takes out of the wheat, why should he not, if it has any feeding value, sell it on its own merits, having the contents set forth on a tag as specified in the regulations applying to all feeds? If there is any feeding value in his product he can do that and sell it at a lower price, but he should not be allowed to mix screenings which are of low feeding value—some are and some are not—with these feeds. I suggest that the minister carry out the main principle of his resolution.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 207 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abraham Brooks.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 209 (from the Senate), for the relief of Clara Welleena Bristol.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 210 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emma Jean Walker.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 211 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ella Maude Gee.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 212 (from the Senate), for the relief of Enid Louise MacDonald.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 213 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Theresa MacIsaac.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 208 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jane Edna Near.—Mr. Guthrie.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 224 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Samuel McDonnell.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 226 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Conkey.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 227 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Marie Pope.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 228 (from the Senate), for the relief of Loretta May Girard.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 229 (from the Senate), for the relief of Birdena Frances Wallace LeMay.—Mr. Guthrie.

THE UNION BANK

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I promised my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke) that we would take up the matter to which he referred this afternoon as soon as the private bills were disposed of. I understand it will be nine o'clock before the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will be able to take his seat, and if my hon. friend from Brandon will allow that matter to stand till that time we will take it up then.

Mr. FORKE: All right.

FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on the resolution of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to provide for the amendment of the Feeding Stuffs Act, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me that the point raised before six o'clock is worth a little

further discussion, as to whether or not the miller should be permitted to incorporate any of the ground screenings in the mill offal. I do not think this matter has received very much attention, and I think it should receive further attention before the resolution is adopted.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may say that after six o'clock I took advantage of the opportunity of discussing this matter with a number of members opposite, including the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy) who is not in his seat and I understand will not be in the House this evening. I have the suggestion made by my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), and the intimation that he did not think the resolution as drafted practicable with respect to the mixing of screenings with shorts, especially under subclause 2 which says:

> That no person shall manufacture pure shorts and shorts and mill screenings at the same mill.

That provision he thinks, as a practical miller, is impracticable, and I am disposed to give some heed to an authority of that nature, especially when it is accompanied by such a practical suggestion as that made by the hon. member for Glengarry and Stormont (Mr. Kennedy), who suggests that all the by-products of the mill should be manufactured in their purity and sold in their purity. That is to say, we would have pure bran, pure shorts, pure middlings, and pure low grade flour. This is my suggestion: Inasmuch as the screenings are bought and paid for as wheat, millers should be permitted, in grinding those screenings, to mix with them any of those by-products that they may think are necessary in order to make those screenings acceptable to the market as long as they call the product screenings. In other words, these mill screenings, let us say, are ground and mixed with a portion of either bran or shorts or middlings, if the millers so desire. They will not mix middlings, because that is too expensive, but they may find it convenient to mix some shorts with the screenings. So long as they sell that as mill screenings, I can see no objection, particularly in view of the fact that they have bought and paid for the whole gross product as wheat. That is the alternative proposition. Because of its simplicity and the opinion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the present draft, with the exception of the first section, is not practicable, I should like to have the other suggestion of the hon. member for Glengarry discussed by the committee. If that is acceptable to the committee as a practical solution after it has been discussed, I am disposed to accept it.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am pleased that the minister is inclined to accept the logical suggestion made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy), and I hope concurred in by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think this is the logical conclusion. There should be no objection to selling mill screenings if there is any feed value in them, but they should not be camouflaged as shorts or anything else. If the millers see fit to mix bran or shorts in the screenings to make the mixture more palatable and of a better feed value, I can see no objection to that, so long as it is sold as screenings; but I do object to screenings being sold as shorts, or as a mixture of shorts and screenings, because, though it is provided in the bill that they should use only the run of mill screenings in the shorts, that is the screenings taken from the wheat from which the shorts are made, I see a difficulty in carrying out the regulation. It would be almost impossible to carry it out, and I think the minister's suggestion is the logical solution of the situation.

Mr. GOULD: Before the House rose, I asked the minister a question concerning this. I might state that on all occasions when bills of this nature have come up, since I have had the honour of being in this House, I have protested against the conduct of millers in the past when they have mixed buckwheat, wild oats, and so forth, in bran, and have sold that as bran. I have been charged as high as $30 a ton for supposed bran which contained a large proportion of wild oats for which they paid nothing. It is a fact that milling companies in western Canada have their initial points throughout the country, and invariably their elevators are constructed without cleaning machinery. As a result of that, they gather in wild oats and buckwheat, which is prevalent and current in the West. They deduct the weight of this largely by guess, and no remuneration for this at all is offered to the individual, although they, in selling back feed stuffs put this value on it. I have protested against milling companies being allowed to use wild oats and even pigweed, and then returning the product to us as bran, shorts and various mill feeds, although they paid nothing for these things. As the minister explained this afternoon, these have a deleterious effect on young stock. With the provision that bran shall be sold as bran, and shorts as shorts, and the other by-products

similarly, possibly a provision might be incorporated that, as pigweed has not much milling value, it might be mentioned in the bill that pigweed could be screened out and whatever there might be in the way of other oats, tame oats, flax, wild buckweat, would make a very good commercial feeding stock to be sent back and sold as such. I commend the action of the minister in segregating the bran and shorts and things of that nature. I might protest that under the Grain Act milling companies at initial points, might be obliged to pay somewhat more for these foreign seeds found in grain, because milling companies which have gathering points on the prairies have an advantage over straight grain companies, in that not having cleaning facilities at their elevators throughout the West, they do not pay for these things.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is it correct that wild oats are sown on the prairies?

Mr. GOULD: Wild oats have not been particularly sown. Persons who sow wild oats do not boast of how many bushels they reap per acre. Some wild oats may make fair feed, but not for young calves.

Mr. NEILL: I would go further than the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture. I would have not only the bran and shorts pure, but the screenings pure. There is no necessity to allow people who are selling screenings to mix shorts or anything else with them, even though they are going to be compelled to call that screenings. I know how soon an arrangement of that kind can enlarge itself, so to speak, and pretty soon there would be a great deal of shorts in it, and it would be called by some composite name, more or less calculated to deceive people. Let us have these things pure. Let those who want to buy or who have that class of stock that can eat screenings mixed with something else, buy it themselves and mix it themselves. Then they will know what they are doing, and there will be no possibility of adulteration or fraud, or even of renovating. It is just as illogical to mix shorts and screenings, as, I dare say, to mix oleomargarine with butter and then sell it as butter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend thinks that will appeal to me.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to suggest that the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr Neill) should be given serious attention. I can very easily see how the opening might be used for the gradual admixture of various products with the screenings, disguising them and probably defeating the very object we have in view. It seems to me that the legislation contemplated is, in the main, admirable. It is something that has been needed for a long time, and I should like to endorse it very much. The minister, however, might go just a little further and make it necessary for those who wish to feed screenings, to do their own mixing, and not to have the mixing done at the point of manufacture. I might mention, too, in that connection, that I think it is very necessary to have these screenings tagged—probably that is compulsory anyway—with tags stating the composition of the feed. I should like to know also whether or not provision is made for the elimination of unpalatable and poisonous weeds from these screenings. Is there any law applying to that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The argument of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) seems quite logical on the surface, but when one remembers that these screenings are bought and paid for as wheat it would seem to partake of the nature of poetic justice that the millers should be allowed when grinding the screenings to mix with them a proportion of shorts in order to produce a better compound for the market. I am not an advocate of the millers, but I certainly do not think that we should go so far in our restrictions as to hurt unreasonably not only them but ourselves, in refusing to concede to them what I regard as nothing but an elementary right. There is a certain amount of dockage in wheat no matter how excellent in quality it may be, and I do not think it is too much to ask that the millers should be allowed to mix with the screenings some amount of shorts to make it more acceptable to the market. I know that there are certain screenings that cannot be improved by any addition of bran or shorts, but there are others that possibly might be improved by the admixture, and I cannot see any objection to the permission to the millers so to mix their screenings, provided that the product is sold as such. As I say, I am not advocating the cause of the millers and I merely put forward this suggestion with a view to eliciting the opinions of the committee. We are interested in seeing that justice is done everybody, and at the same time we want to be fair to ourselves.

Mr. HOCKEN: I suppose this might be called "renovated feed?"

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know.

Mr. HALBERT: I want to support the minister in the proposal he makes. We must be fair to everyone and if the millers desire to turn out a certain grade of screenings I do not see that there can be any harm in their being permitted to add a certain amount of shorts so long as they label the article as screenings. The millers want to bring the stuff up to the market demands, and what the minister suggests is, I think, only fair.

Mr. CALDWELL: I want to impress upon the minister as forcefully as I can the necessity when making regulations to insist that all screenings shall be ground as finely as possible. There are certain noxious weeds which are very small and are exceedingly difficult to grind. This is true particularly of mustard seed, and the regulations should provide that the grinding shall be so thorough as to preclude all possibility of these noxious weeds passing into the feed with the likelihood afterwards of germination.

Mr. NEILL: I can see no necessity, from any sense of poetic or any other form of justice, for granting the request of the millers that they be allowed to mix shorts with their screenings. I have a long experience with the habits and methods of millers from the point of view of the purchaser and I am not a bit afraid that they will fall into bad financial waters through any such act. They are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves, and we need have no concern about them so far as this matter is concerned. This proposed adulteration will work out, as adulteration in all cases works out, in this way. The agent of the milling company comes along and says: "We have a nice line of stuff we call screenings at $20 a ton." The dealer says, "Well, that is a big price to ask for it because you don't pay anything for the stuff except the price of the sack and the filling of it." "Oh," he says, "but there is 50, 60, 70 per cent of shorts in it. While we call it screenings to comply with the law it is really mostly shorts, and the mixture is so much better." Now, no one will know exactly how much shorts the screenings will contain, because the percentage will not be marked on the sacks, and you will really buy a pig in a poke, as the saying is. The fact is that nobody will know what he is getting if this mixture is permitted, whereas if the screenings were sold by themselves the consumer could mix it to suit himself. Young pigs will require a different food from that which is given to older animals, and the main thing is to sell a pure article. This principle animated hon. members in discussing the question of oleomargarine. Hon. gentlemen were opposed to any adulteration creeping into the manufacture of butter, and the same thing should apply here. There is no question whatever about justice in the matter; if the millers have bran to sell let them sell it as bran; if they have screenings to sell let it be so labelled. But do not allow any adulteration.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) expressed the same opinion I hold in regard to noxious weeds. It is a well-known fact that in the grinding of mill feeds the smaller weed seeds are not crushed, especially mustard seed, with the result that they are capable of germination subsequently. I think that mustard seeds should be eliminated from the feeds. These seeds are a burden and an expense to the man who ships them and milling companies naturally look upon them as a nuisance unless they can be allowed to re-ship them in some other form. The Minister of Agriculture knows very well that to send these seeds back to the country is merely to intensify and perpetuate a menace. I think that the bill should provide at least that the percentage of these seeds that are included in mill feeds shall be stated. This principle was embodied in a bill which was discussed in the Agriculture committee on a former occasion, and I believe it is an important safeguard. With regard to the question of mixing bran and shorts in screenings, I think the sense of the committee is rather against the suggestion. If there is to be sold good shorts properly milled and kept dry I do not think there will be any difficulty in securing a good market for it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: To meet the consensus of opinion in the committee in regard to paragraph (c) of the resolution, I move that it be amended by striking out the word "pure" in the first line, and the words "shorts and mill screenings," and inserting after the word "flour" the words "or screenings," so that the paragraph will read:

—the bran, shorts, middlings, feed, flour or screenings meet the requirements, etc.

With regard to the matter raised by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, that is something that will be dealt with by regulation and we shall try to meet his views as far as possible.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move that we strike out sub-paragraph (d) and paragraph 2, because they are contingent upon the first paragraph and can be dispensed with now. Then paragraph 3 will become paragraph 2.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 233 to amend the Feeding Stuffs Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

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

Mr. MOTHERWELL: With the consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, now.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Mr. CALDWELL: When does the act come into effect?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the absence of any stipulated time it comes into effect when assented to, I understand.

Mr. GOOD: We have no copies of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Progress reported.

PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the bill to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act was given second reading, and then you thought it advisable to postpone the committee stage until later during the sitting. I think we might take up the bill now.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Mr. BUREAU moved that the House go into committee on Bill 238 to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act.

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

On section 1—Regulations for sale and use of naphtha for illuminating purposes.

Mr. GARDINER: Can we have this bill distributed?

The CHAIRMAN: There are only proof prints here. I will read the sections.

Mr. BUREAU: Naphtha is not sold for illuminating purposes now except under certain regulations for street lighting or whenever the vapour of naphtha can be used from tanks placed outside the building. There has been a lamp on the market for a number of years called the Coleman lamp, in which naphtha can be used without any danger whatever according to reports of experts, but as the law stands you cannot buy naphtha for this lamp. These amendments are intended to do away with this disability by giving the Governor in Council power to control the sale of naphtha.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that Bill No. 236, to amend The Canada Shipping Act, be read the second time.

Motion agreed to and bill considered in committee and reported.

Mr. LAPOINTE moved that the bill be read the third time.

Mr. CALDWELL: Will the minister explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I gave the explanation yesterday. The law as it is gives the Governor in Council power to suspend the coastal laws as applying to vessels of a foreign country which extends similar privileges to Canadian vessels. We are asking the power to suspend the coastal laws in other circumstances in cases of emergency when it is in the interests of the Canadian people that such action should be taken. The coastal laws have been suspended on two or three occasions in a way that was hardly legal, and that has demonstrated the necessity for this amendment.

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

LAKE GRAIN RATES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that Bill No. 235, with respect to Freight Rates for the Carriage of Grain by Lake and River Navigation, be read the second time.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the bill been distributed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: I suggest that if any other bills that have not been distributed to the members of the House are to be considered to-night, they should be immediately placed before us so that we shall know what we are voting for.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that copies of this bill were distributed this afternoon.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) spoke truly last evening when he said that this bill was one of paramount importance and should receive the careful consideration of the House.

9 p.m. At the outset I may say that I am entirely in accord with the action of the government in bringing forward this much-needed measure, and I extend to the government and to the hon. minister who is fathering the bill my congratulations for their courage in taking this step. Undoubtedly they are dealing with large and powerful interests that are dominated by prominent men in this country; they are dealing with a subject which must, as the minister himself said, present considerable difficulty so far as legislation bearing upon it is concerned. The people of Canada are to be congratulated that the government, upon these matters being put before them, moved promptly and with despatch. It is courageous legislation, and the result of its enactment should be greatly beneficial to the people of western Canada in particular and to the people of Canada as a whole. The rates affecting the transport of the products of that part of our country which is far removed from its market, situated as it is in the centre of this wide continent—freight rates by rail and by lake—constitute one of the most important problems that we in the West have to deal with.

It is quite appropriate that the Liberal party, which broke the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly by the effecting of the Crowsnest pass arrangement in 1897, an arrangement which was practically re-established last year, should, upon accession to power in these latter times, break the shipping monopoly that had fastened itself upon the people of western Canada. But the present government have gone further than that: During this session they have enacted an anti-combine bill, a measure that will enable those administering the criminal law to secure the necessary evidence in connection with any alleged combine. Under the criminal law as it existed the great difficulty was that you could not get the evidence, but under the anti-combine bill the evidence can be procured if a case exists. That, together with the bill that has just been passed enabling us to bring in legitimate competition against those who are dealing unfairly in the matter of privileges they enjoy under our shipping laws, should be ample protection, so far as the Great Lakes are concerned, to the producers of western Canada and should result in benefit to the whole Dominion.

There was appointed in February of this year, following the reports made to the government, a royal commission composed of three able men. Mr. Levi Thomson, a man who had lived for long years in western Canada, a man thoroughly familiar with the grain trade, a man who had had parliamentary experience and also was trained in the reception and weighing of evidence, was on that commission—undoubtedly a very suitable appointment. Mr. McLean was also there, a man with experience in dealing with rates; and Mr. Tremblay, a business man. Now, it was suggested last night in the course of the debate that this board should be composed of shippers who knew something of the shipping trade. That was not necessary at all, because the shipping interests were represented by the very ablest counsel that money could procure. All the facts that they could possibly present in their favour were laid before this commission. The government was represented by an able western counsel, a man of great experience in rate matters, a man whose practice for the last four or five years had been very wide in that particular field. That gentleman knew exactly where to go to get evidence, and how to bring it before the commission. So that, after all, it is not a question of the knowledge of the commissioners themselves. If you get fair-minded men, of moderate and reasonable view, men of sound and capable judgment, who can weigh and appraise the evidence brought before them by experts you make a judicious choice. In that respect the government selected, very wisely, an able commission, a commission against whom no charge of partiality could be advanced; and those hon. members who have read that commission's report will find that the statements made therein are moderate, reasonable, thoughtful and fair. There is in it nothing extreme, nothing unusual; the report is judicial in tone and judicial in language and thought.

Now, the story which the report of that commission unfolds is one of the most remarkable stories of trade and commerce ever told in this or any other country. The Great Lakes afford the only real outlet for our grain because the cost of transportation by rail is, as you all know, too high to permit it to be used entirely as a roadway for that grain. Some thirteen or fourteen years ago two enterprising young Dutch-Americans by the name of Wolvin, who had had their training in the western United States and were operating from Duluth, came up into Canada and in company with one Norcross engaged in shipping on the Great Lakes. They gradually worked up a combination and this monopoly

became very strong. For thirteen years it grew stronger and stronger, and bolder and bolder as each year went by. Finally, apparently undaunted by anything, they imposed on the shippers and producers of western Canada extortionate and unusual freight rates which culminated last year in discrimination against the very country that gave them its protection under its shipping rules. Finally there was created an organization which proceeded to intimidate its victims whom it compelled to take shipping space at its own rates over their own lakes. Like a leech or a weasel it fastened itself on the main artery of western Canada's trade and proceeded to bleed the West and the western producer slowly to death. Not only was that the prospect in sight, but there was even the likelihood of competing Canadian shipping being driven from our Great Lakes as Van Tromp the countryman of the Wolvins, once boasted he would drive British shipping from the seas.

The evidence shows that the method pursued by this company was to secure the co-operation of the Canada Steamships Limited. The Canada Steamships Limited was formed on the 17th June, 1913, with its head office in Montreal, and an authorized capital of $25,000,000. Among the directors we find the names of prominent men, at least one of whom is a member of this House, and another the head of the Canadian National Railways at this time.

Mr. DUFF: Sir Henry Thornton is a director.

Mr. McMURRAY: Yes, and R. M. Wolvin, one of the individuals to whom I have alluded. There was formed in Winnipeg about the same time a company known as the Standard Shipping Company. The latter entered into an arrangement with the $25,000,000 company, the Canada Steamships Limited. This arrangement was most unusual in the shipping trade in the fact that it was reduced to writing. The purport of the contract was that this company, with headquarters in Winnipeg, was to have the sole right, so far as Canada Steamships Limited was concerned, to charter all space upon its vessels. In return for this it was to be given insurance placed upon all cargoes. These companies insisted that all grain shipped should be insured. There was an insurance company in the United States with whom every man in the West, who is shipping grain, was obliged to place his insurance, and this insurance was set at just twice the rate which could be obtained in other places. The loss incurred by all those who shipped grain was very large. I think the United Grain Growers last year claimed they lost $36,000 by being compelled to take this insurance; and the total loss in respect of all shippers ran into thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. DUFF: Do the grain shippers of the West simply insure their grain from Fort William to Montreal, or do they have a through rate from Winnipeg to Liverpool or some other point on the other side?

Mr. McMURRAY: My understanding is, the rate is from Fort William to the port on the lakes to which the grain is shipped. If it is going to Port Colborne the rate is to that place; if to Montreal the rate is to that port.

Mr. DUFF: Why do they not get through insurance from Fort William to Liverpool?

Mr. McMURRAY: The Standard Shipping Company, to which I have just referred will not permit them to do so.

Mr. DUFF: What do you mean by the Standard Shipping Company?

Mr. McMURRAY: The Standard Shipping Company is the company in Winnipeg which made this bargain with the Canada Steamships Limited that they would insure all the cargoes that were placed on board its vessels. Now, a singular thing in connection with this matter is, that before the contract would expire—I think it was to expire 1928—it was renewed for another period of twelve years, so that it would not terminate until 1940, the full intention being that this monopoly that had been settled upon by the shippers of western Canada was to be continued for a long period of time. The commission found as a fact that a combination existed. They found that these various shipping companies on the lakes met in Toronto on the 4th of May and entered into what the commission found to be a combine. Then they met on the 8th May; and again on the 28th July they met in the city of New York. Their finding was that there was a combination. What did this combination do? They first exacted a tribute from the people of western Canada of double insurance on every cargo sent out. They discriminated against Canadian ports. They shipped from Fort William to Buffalo at a lower rate than they would ship from Fort William to the Georgian bay ports, although there was a difference in distance in favour of the Georgian bay ports of 316 miles. These rates were found to be actually fixed at the meeting to which I refer, and confirmed at a subsequent

meeting. Apparently all the shipping interests on those lakes were in this combination. We find them going so far that a grain buyer, I think it was in Chicago, declared that he would not be held up under these conditions at all, and proposed to charter a boat, to send it up to the head of the lakes, and bring down the grain independently of them. This proposal was met by a warning given to the shippers in Winnipeg that they would have difficulty in securing space for the shipment of grain. Probably it was not in those words, but to that effect. It would be interesting to read the summary of the findings of this commission. The first thing they find is as follows:

> In the opinion of your commission a tacit understanding between these operators as to those rates existed during the whole season, and measures should be taken to prevent its continuation.

The second thing they found was:

> Rates on grain between Canadian ports were discriminatory as compared with rates charged by Canadian operators on grain and other bulk freight between Canadian and United States ports, and as compared with those charged by American operators on grain and other bulk freight between United States ports.

It was contended by the shipping companies, as suggested by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), in his illustrations before the House last night, that this discrimination might be caused by congestion in the ports, but in the fourth paragraph of the summary of the findings of the commission they say:

> Congestion was as bad at Buffalo as at Port Colborne, and was worse than at Bay ports; Therefore, discrimination cannot be justified by congestion.

Another contention set up by these shippers was that the advantage was with the American ports and that the vessels going in could operate at a lower rate on account of the fact that there was a return cargo—that was coal—going northwards; but the evidence showed that coal only constituted on this occasion some 22 per cent, and I think over a period of years some 29 per cent; so that all these vessels were coming back light, American as well as Canadian, and the concluding words of the commissioners were as follows:

> It would seem, however, that in general, the advantage possessed by the American vessel in respect of coal is not so great as represented.

As an offset to that the commission state in paragraph 7 of their finding:

> On the other hand, it has been admitted that labour costs were lower on the Canadian side than on the American.

They find these rates were unjustifiably high, and in paragraph 8 they say:

> After making due allowance for additional cost of operating and handling to which the grain was subject, but which did not apply to ore and coal, there is still an excess of earnings from the transportation of grain between Canadian ports over earnings from the carriage of other bulk freight, which shows high and unjustifiable rates.

Then they say in paragraph 9:

> The increase of the 1922 rates over those of 1921 by Canadian vessel operators was so great as to be high and unjustifiable.

Paragraph 11 reads:

> The season of 1922 was characterized by high levels of rates which cannot but have been detrimental to all those engaged in the production and disposal of grain.

They found that it was injurious to the farmer who produced the grain, and the reason for that was forcibly explained yesterday by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales). Paragraph 11 continues:

> And it is therefore essential that through control of the upper levels of rates the competitive principle which has been relied upon by parliament in the case of water transportation should be permitted to be operative.

That is there must be free competition on the lakes. Paragraph 12 of the report reads:

> The difficulties in the way of controlling rates on lake-borne grain are such that your commission is of the opinion that the only feasible method of rate control through a regulative tribunal is through maximum rates.

They have considered apparently, as they naturally would, all the possibilities of restoring competition among the shipping interests, and they came to the conclusion that the only possible release that could be given would be by the fixing of a maximum rate. They also suggest the power to suspend the coastal laws in respect to the grain trade be conferred upon the Governor in Council. It is suggested in this connection that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics should keep statistical records of the port cargoes in the coasting trade, such records to be based on returns from the vessel or vessel companies operating. As the bill was just put in my hands a short time ago, I do not know what provision there is for the suspending of these coastal laws. My own impression is that these coastal laws should be suspended on recommendation made to the government by the board or commission which deals with these rates. I believe that that would be a fair thing, because we are putting the control of this matter in the hands of an independent tribunal. We are giving them power independently of parliament to fix the

rates. Why should we not also give them power to lift the coastal shipping regulations. It is possible that we are lifting this matter as far as possible out of politics. It is said that we have lifted our railways out of the control of politics, in order that they may be fairly and properly operated in the interest of the people; and I submit that it would give satisfaction to the people of this country to feel that there was a tribunal independent of parliament, independent of the people and of these shipping companies, to deal with the question of the lifting of these coastal laws. It is in the interest of the government itself to prevent any criticism that might be fairly levelled against it through some misunderstanding on the part of the people of Canada, if they thought the coasting laws should not be lifted. A charge might be made against the government in the future, and the government be absolutely innocent. But if there is an independent body that has the confidence of all concerned in the country, that charge would not be levied against the government; the government would consequently be in a better position, and the people of Canada would be fully satisfied. I do not know whether that clause is in the bill or not; I have not read the bill; but speaking for myself, I would respectfully urge the minister and the government to give it consideration.

The commission points out the inequality of this insurance "hold-up." I use a common term, an opprobrious term, but that is the correct term to use. I am glad to see that the minister has inserted in his bill a drastic and strong provision, making it prohibitive for a chartering broker to have anything to do at all with placing insurance. It was charged in our Banking committee not long ago that banks are interfering with the functions of insurance, and compelling people who placed their securities with them for loans, to insure through them. That is absolutely unfair in this case. A man shipping his grain should have the right to go out into the market and to buy insurance in open competition if such can be had.

Some questions have been raised in connection with this bill by hon. members on this side of the House. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), last evening expressed a sentiment, that is no doubt believed in by many members on both sides of the House, when he enunciated the old doctrine of "laissez faire" of the Manchester School of economics, holding that legislation cannot ultimately correct; that the only corrective thing can be competition. I would remind my hon. friend that in the days when the Manchester School flourished, England was reaching out for wider and wider markets, and competition existed in the effort to secure those wider markets. A great change has come over the economic world since then. Large combinations in restraint of trade have come into existence. The principle of watered stock now exists, and as regards practical measures, the doctrines of Cobden, Bright and John Stuart Mill are almost useless when it comes to devising an instrument curtailing monopolies that exist to-day. The condition is exceptional in that we have a monopoly, like that of the old German robber barons of the Rhine, who levied toll on all who passed up and down the river, controlling the single outlet for our grain, and I do not believe that if those members of the Manchester School were situated as the people of Canada are to-day they would contend that the doctrine of "laissez faire" applies or could apply. Can you tolerate licensed robbery under an economic doctrine of "laissez faire?"

Mr. SALES: Does the hon. member wish to infer that there is watered stock in the Canada Steamships Company?

Mr. McMURRAY: Does the hon. member suggest that there is not?

Mr. SALES: I did not. I was asking the hon. member.

Mr. McMURRAY: If I suggested it?

Mr. SALES: Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY: I made no suggestion at all. I said simply that they had $25,000,000 worth of stock. My hon. friend can draw his own conclusions.

The second point made by the senior member for Halifax, was that he doubted the legality of this measure which we now are placing on the statute books. I gathered from his speech that he had two points, first, that this is not sound economics; second, that it is not legal. He did not state in what the illegality consisted, but I presume he thought it was an interference by the Dominion government with matters that were purely provincial. I do not think lake Superior or lake Huron is part and parcel of the province of Ontario. They are Dominion waters; they are international waters, and navigation laws belong solely to the Dominion. I respectfully contend, because I have a very high opinion of my hon. friend's standing as a lawyer, that in this he is wrong. In my opinion if the government has jurisdiction anywhere, it is in regard to navigation on inland waters. I would go further and say that if there is any

doubt at all about the matter, we shall put the law into force and let the other fellow, the monopolist, fight it.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), feared that we could not fix rates from American ports to Canadian ports and vice versa. He seems to think, if I gathered his remarks correctly, that there was a danger of driving this shipping from Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not affirming or denying whether that is correct or not. I did not make the argument or the deduction which my hon. friend makes.

Mr. McMURRAY: Did he simply raise the query then, that that might happen?

Mr. STEVENS: I made the statement that we could not fix rates between a Canadian port and an American port, or between an American port and a Canadian port, and that that would affect the usefulness of the measure.

Mr. McMURRAY: Then I misunderstood my hon. friend's argument. What we can do is this, we can fix rates that will be fair and reasonable. The tribunal appointed will, I submit, be composed of men of reputation for fairness and ability. They will probably have associated with them an efficient staff that will gather all data that is needed in order to arrive at a right and proper rate. I think the shipping interests need have no fear whatever that they will not receive at the hands of this properly-appointed tribunal, fair and proper treatment. If they are treated fairly and properly, there need be no fear of their discriminating against Canada. As a matter of fact, they cannot discriminate against Canada more than they have done already. Even if there is danger of their withdrawing from operation in Canada, there exists in this country a condition of affairs that no self-respecting government, when the facts are laid before them, can possibly tolerate any longer, and the government must act in the matter irrespective of consequences. The government must not be intimidated by any argument of that nature.

This combine that had the audacity to charge these terrific rates and to impose an illegal and altogether improper insurance on the shipper had the temerity to intimidate the people of Winnipeg. There is a series of interesting telegrams that passed between the members of this combine. They appear at page 19 of the report and I think that in all fairness to those who may come after us they should be placed on Hansard so that there may be no misapprehension if the subject ever comes up again for discussion. These telegrams display the same intimidating attitude to those who had the courage to appeal to this government for protection against the injustice and the predatory measures practised against them. When one reads and carefully studies this report, when one ponders the evidence, one is appalled at the boldness of these men who secured control of the only shipping channel for our western grain. The name "Wolvin" is significant, and it is difficult for anyone to speak dispassionately and calmly as he realizes that significance in its fullest extent. The nearest synonym that I can suggest for it, if it has any English equivalent, would be the word "wolverine." The wolverine is described as a "voracious, sagacious and ferocious animal," and apparently these men exhibited all these qualities, because they were certainly voracious, they were undoubtedly sagacious, and to the shippers of western Canada they were beyond any question "ferocious." Hon. members will realize the audacity of this whole matter when they read the telegrams that were exchanged, as disclosed in this report. Mr. Enderby, of the Canada Steamship Lines, despatched the following message to Mr. L. H. Wolvin, the man handling the Standard Steamship Companies in Winnipeg which collected this illegal insurance. The telegram is dated September 27, 1922:

> Better get those instructions to Winnipeg in writing about booking no more cargoes until this coasting law question settled. Our agreement was now (no?) new business. Make your instructions to them absolutely definite.

That is to say, if the government delayed in settling this coasting law question they would hold up the entire grain movement at the head of the lakes. On September 15, 1922, the following telegram was sent:

> L. H. WOLVIN, Esq.,
> Central Shipping Co.,
> Postal Telegraph Bldg.,
> Chicago, Ill.
>
> We are not chartering any more Canadian boats for September loading. Think it best to clean up what we have and if we have open space we can get pretty nearly whatever we ask for it. We are doing some October but thought perhaps we had better hold off on this also except with Sid Smith he is figuring half million lastaff abstract which we should supply him and then raise rate. Answer.
>
> W. W. HALL.

This man had to get his grain out on the market and he started to curry favour with these shipping barons; so he was to be given an opportunity of getting his half million out before the rates were raised. On October 3, we find the following telegram from the same man, Hall:

L. H. WOLVIN, Esq.,
c/o R. A. & W. M. Williams,
Kirby Bldg.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Hope you are able to advise us soon with regard to ore and want to point out to you that before taking care of O'Donahue we had better take care of Sid Smith who was first to wire Minister of Marine this morning at length explaining situation as it really is with regard to shipping, and he is as badly in need of tonnage to fill his sales as any other shipper in the building and will be in very bad hole if we cannot help him out on some grain on or before tenth. He just showed the difference between willingness to help us and careless attitude that most of others had.

W. W. HALL.

All this occurred in Canada, and it is nothing but straight intimidation. These people dared to punish those who would not openly advocate the rates under which they themselves were operating.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not my hon. friend believe that people who own shipping should have a right to barter in the market for the highest possible price for their commodity, and if they refuse to accept any other than their own price should they be compelled to do so? In other words, ought not the matter to be regulated by the law of supply and demand?

Mr. McMURRAY: In open competition, yes; but not under combines, which are illegal.

Mr. MARTELL: Where has any combine been proven?

Mr. McMURRAY: If the hon. member had been listening to me for the last forty minutes he would agree, I think, that it has been absolutely proven.

Mr. MARTELL: I should like the hon. gentleman to state in two or three words where there has been proved to be a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Mr. McMURRAY: The hon. gentleman evidently has not read the report of the commission. If he has, then his memory is foggy.

Mr. MARTELL: Not in the least.

Mr. McMURRAY: The very first paragraph in the summary states that there was a combine:

—and in the opinion of your commission a tacit understanding between these operators as to those rates existed during the whole season, and measures should be taken to prevent its continuation.

I have not found that there was a combine; the tribunal appointed to consider the question unanimously decided that there was.

Mr. MARTELL: Who were the practical shipping men on the commission?

Mr. McMURRAY: I went into that question before the hon. member came in.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not trying to offer any factious opposition.

Mr. McMURRAY: There is one more telegram I want to put on record. On October 11, 1922, there was a telegram from L. H. Wolvin, Cleveland, Ohio, to W. W. Hall, Winnipeg, as follows:

OKay Smith's Bay charter. Keep this strictly confidential. Do not want to offer Stewart anything just now account of Ottawa. Where can I telegraph Stewart?

Stewart was the man in Winnipeg who had the courage and the backbone to protest against this combine and to appeal to the government for protection. Smith, who was the first to wire the Minister of Marine, was to have protection; he was to be taken care of by these concerns. But Stewart, the manly man, the man who had the courage to stand up and fight for himself as a man should, was to be punished. I should like to see the telegram that Sid Smith sent to the Minister of Marine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is disclosed in this very brief report, which is evidently written by reasonable and fair-minded men, such an appalling condition of affairs as I do not think has ever before existed either in this country or in the United States. No school of economics can justify this abuse or apply a remedy; parliament itself must intervene. Who is going to compete against this gigantic organization known as the Canada Steamships Company with its $25,000,000 capital in ships? One company that did try in Winnipeg was intimidated and told it could not get space. The head of that company, rich and wealthy though he was, and a powerful magnate in the United States, could not get his grain down the lakes, and I presume he had either to cancel his contract or take space at the rates dictated by the combination. Where such a combination is in absolute control, and there can be no competition, can any hon. member seriously and honestly argue, whether he be committed to the policy of free trade and the doctrine of the Manchester School —and I believe in it very strongly myself, but I recognize that changing conditions have modified its applicability and, indeed, made it impossible of application, such as when strong forces absolutely shut out competition —can any hon. member contend for a moment that the government should not intervene? I do not think so, I feel confident that he will agree with me in my submission that the government must take action. In the United States government control is exer-

cised on the regular routes by virtue of the Alexander Act, which is referred to in this report. Even with this limited jurisdiction the commission finds that competition is kept alive on the American side, but it found no evidence of any competition on the Canadian side.

I congratulate the government upon having the courage to introduce legislation that will, I believe, curb these great and powerful interests, prevent their again exacting extortionate rates from our shippers in the West, and put an end to the discrimination which those interests have exercised against our ports in favour of American ports. I do not think that this legislation will drive our grain away from its natural outlet down the St. Lawrence river to Montreal and Quebec. It is undoubtedly in the interests of western Canada, as well as of Montreal and Quebec, it is undoubtedly in the interests of all people, including our millers, that this combine should be broken. I do not think that we may have to deal with it harshly. I think that the publicity which will attend the work of investigation and examination by the Grain Commission, coupled with the power of suspending the coasting laws, will effectually curb this combine without inflicting any injury upon it.

I feel that criminal proceedings should be taken against these men who have so flagrantly and audaciously defied the laws of this country—the very laws that gave them protection and enabled them to operate their business. When the labouring men of Canada were charged with illegally combining—as happened in western Canada a few years ago—the Dominion government did not hesitate to invade the jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba and insist upon their trial. I think this Liberal government should deal fearlessly with large interests, no matter how powerful they may be, in the same way as they deal with the humblest citizen in the land when occasion demands it. The question came up last night as to where the jurisdiction lay for prosecution. As was properly stated by the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald), the criminal law of Canada is administered by the provinces. I believe that the criminal prosecution undertaken in Winnipeg by the Dominion government serveral years ago was a most unusual invasion of the provincial field and was done under the War Measures Act. This government to-day cannot come into the province and prosecute this combine without invading provincial rights. The province of Manitoba has full jurisdiction to arraign its citizens for misdemeanours against the state, a jurisdiction which is common to all the provinces, and would not tolerate any invasion of its jurisdiction by the Dominion authorities. It would be a breach of the constitution for the Dominion government to attempt such invasion. In a word, while we desire to punish these men severely, we must ourselves respect the law of the land. But there is nothing to hinder the government laying criminal charges against these men in the proper courts of Manitoba, and then it rests with the attorney general of the province to proceed. I am sure that so far as western Canada is concerned, the attorneys general would co-operate with the Minister of Justice in any criminal proceedings that may be considered advisable. I think the men forming this oppressive combine should be dealt with under the criminal law. Such a course would be a step towards wiping out this stain on Canada's honour. And I am confident that the men in question would receive a fair trial in our criminal courts. I am also confident that the passing of this legislation will ensure fair treatment of our shipping interests. Therefore I am strongly in favour of the bill with the exception which I have mentioned.

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) has read some very interesting telegrams regarding the combine on the Great Lakes, but there is one message that the hon. member did not read, and as I am sure it will interest the House I propose to put it on Hansard. It is from Mr. Roy Wolvin to his Winnipeg agents, and reads as follows:

Nye Jenks—

This is the Chicago firm.

—working for another cargo Chicago-Buffalo, trying to write their own insurance.

This is the crime.

I am getting very tired of trying to uphold the situation of the vessel-broker. We are in a wonderful position to break every vessel-agent on the lakes, and I want you to notify our Winnipeg agents that if one of them produces a boat to load at Chicago that I am absolutely through and will do business for nothing until everyone of them are out of the game, which you know I can do and will do. Solicit them all. Show them this telegram and tell them I mean every word I say.

I just wanted to add this to the telegrams read by the hon. member.

Mr. CAHILL: Who signed that?

Mr. BANCROFT: Roy Wolvin.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): The bill introduced this evening in pursuance of the resolution moved by the Minister of Trade

and Commerce (Mr. Robb) last night purports to regulate freight rates for the carriage of grain by lake and river navigation. Before that bill passes I would like to express my views in regard to it. Last evening the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke), referring to some of the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine carrying grain on the Great Lakes, made the witty remark that he saw I was waking up. Well, Sir, I not only woke up on that occasion but I have been rubbing my eyes a good deal since. When I read this resolution on the order paper and had a chance to read the bill which was submitted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) I rubbed my eyes and wondered exactly where I was. I remember that three or four years ago in different sessions of this House, Mr. J. E. Armstrong, then a member of this parliament, introduced a resolution providing for the regulating of freight rates on the Great Lakes. At that time Mr. Armstrong was sitting on one side of the House and the present Minister of Trade and Commerce and a number of gentlemen now sitting on this side were occupying benches opposite. I listened at that time with a great deal of interest to the able speeches Mr. Armstrong made in his attempts to prove to the government and parliament of that day that freight rates should be regulated, and I listened also with interest to the speeches made by my political friends sitting with me on the opposite side. As I say, I have been rubbing my eyes to-night, as I realize that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is trying to regulate freight rates on the Great Lakes. The party which I supported two or three years ago, in different speeches, opposed Mr. Armstrong's motion, and, I think I am correct in saying, voted against him on more than one occasion.

Mr. McMURRAY: The conditions have become worse since then.

Mr. DUFF: It is all very well to say that, but to my mind the conditions are no worse today than they were then.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DUFF: It is not a matter of fixing the freight rates; it is a matter of getting after the combines. I want to say right here and now, with all due respect to the different hon. members who have spoken in favour of the resolution and the bill which is now introduced based upon it, that they have not put up one argument in favour of fixing the rates. Any argument they did put up that had any force was in favour of getting after the combines, and I am with them as far as they want to go in that regard. But neither the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), the leader of the Progressive party, nor any other hon. member who spoke on this question proved to my satisfaction that it was necessary to fix rates on the Great Lakes; what they did prove was that a combine existed between different shipping companies on the Great Lakes. Well, just a few days ago we introduced a combines bill, and I say that if there is a combine the government should go after these men and prevent a recurrence of what has been happening during the last few years. But the various speakers kept clear of any argument in favour of the fixing of rates on the Great Lakes. Their whole case was based on the alleged existence of combines; their whole wail was that these steamship companies had amalgamated to fix rates and to make the shippers pay double rates of insurance, and that there also was a combine in regard to the brokerage and the making of arrangements respecting cargoes for the different boats. That was their whole argument.

10 p.m.

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

Mr. DUFF: I suppose so.

Mr. MILLAR: I would like to ask if he read paragraph 9, page 52 of the report of the commission, which says:

> The increase of the 1922 rates over those of 1921 by the Canadian vessel operators was so great as to be high and unjustifiable.

Mr. DUFF: I do not know why my hon. friend asks me that question. All I have said is this, that in their speeches to which I have had the pleasure of listening, the hon. member for North Winnipeg, the leader of the Progressive party and others have made out no case for the fixing of rates by the government on the Great Lakes or anywhere else. I did say that those speeches had proved that there was a combine. that different vessel owners on the Great Lakes had combined to fix rates and to make shippers insure their cargoes with them; and I say that condition should be remedied. It is the duty of the government to try to remedy it if at all possible.

Mr. McMURRAY: May I ask my learned friend a question?

Mr. DUFF: I am not your learned friend.

Mr. McMURRAY: My hon. friend—I beg his pardon.

Mr. DUFF: I am a sea lawyer.

Mr. McMURRAY: May I ask my hon. friend what he would require in the form of

evidence to satisfy him as to the necessity for fixing rates?

Mr. DUFF: That is rather a large order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DUFF: If my hon. friend had given us any evidence to demonstrate the necessity of fixing rates, he would not have had to ask me that question. I repeat that my hon. friend although he is an able lawyer, has given this House no reasons why the government should bring forward this bill to fix the rates on the Great Lakes.

I was saying that my hon. friends on this side of the House who opposed the fixing of rates two or three years ago are now bringing in this legislation. There must be some reason for that. I have been rubbing my eyes; as the hon. leader of the Progressives said, I have been waking up and wondering what is the reason.

Mr. McMURRAY: My hon. friend had better rub them a little more.

Mr. DUFF: I am going to rub them a little more, and perhaps the hon. member for North Winnipeg will rub his and my western friends will rub theirs when they hear what I am about to say. I have a good deal of sympathy with the people who live on the prairies. The hon. member for "Bowlegged" river laughs again, but I repeat that I have a good deal of sympathy with the people on the prairies, and I proved it last year when I was a member of the special committee on freight rates and on the Crowsnest pass agreement. I have sympathy for my western friends, because I believe in a lower tariff. I do not believe in protection, and I say to my western friends that in my opinion you could not have a worse kind of protection than that which is contained within the pages of Bill No. 235. If my western friends were consistent in regard to Liberal principles they would not, in my humble opinion, support this legislation.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: We will suspend the coastal laws, then. That will produce the desired result.

Mr. DUFF: Will that satisfy my hon. friend?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Certainly.

Mr. DUFF: Well, we have done that; so you do not need this legislation at all.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I did not understand that it was already done.

Mr. DUFF: Oh yes, it is done. You are satisfied; you will vote with me, so that is all right.

Mr. FORKE: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but I would call his attention to the fact that this legislation does not exactly fix rates. It will only fix a maximum rate; it will not interfere with competition. When the rates get so high that they are out of reason, then the board can fix the maximum rate. It is not a case of fixing the rates all along the line—I do not suppose that will ever occur.

Mr. DUFF: Then the legislation is not necessary.

Mr. FORKE: It is there as a safeguard.

Mr. DUFF: I say it is bad legislation; I say it is not Liberal legislation. I want to tell my hon. friends from the West that the man who is most anxious to get this legislation is Sir Clifford Sifton, a director of the British Empire Steel Corporation and of Canada Steamships Limited. Now, there is a nigger in the woodpile somewhere, and before my hon. friends from the West throw up their hands and vote for this measure they had better ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to put it back for a while and find out why Sir Clifford Sifton is so much interested in the matter. I say it is not going to help the farmers in the West at all. I do not know whether Sir Clifford Sifton has some interest in Winnipeg or not, but I find that these rates are going to be fixed by the Board of Grain Commissioners in the city of Winnipeg. There is something wrong when we find Sir Clifford Sifton's name associated with this project. I do not say he had any influence on the government in the matter of bringing in the bill, but the fact remains that Sir Clifford Sifton, a director of the British Empire Steel Corporation and Canada Steamships Limited, is one of the men who wants this thing more than anybody else.

Mr. FORKE: I would ask the hon. member whether he has any proof for that assertion?

Mr. ROBB: I would like to say to my hon. friend right now, in justice to Sir Clifford Sifton, that I have here a registered list of the directors of Canada Steamships Limited, dated March, 1921, and that the name of Sir Clifford Sifton does not appear upon it. It is a sworn list.

Mr. DUFF: Perhaps Sir Henry Thornton has been put on in his place. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce wants to take the part of Sir Clifford Sifton in this matter all right, I am satisfied; but if this

is true of the Canada Steamships Limited it is true of the British Empire Steel. Both are very closely associated.

Mr. McMURRAY: May I ask my hon. friend what the relationship is between the Canada Steamships Limited and the British Empire Steel?

Mr. DUFF: Well, I should like to say to my hon. friend that if he brands them both as wolverines they are the same brand of wolverines, if that will satisfy him. But Mr. Wolvin and Mr. Norcross are two gentlemen who are connected with both the British Empire Steel and Canada Steamships Limited. I would not refer to them as wolverines. I think they are gentlemen and big business men in this country, men who have done a lot for Canada; and even if they do charge excessive rates on the Great Lakes that is no reason why they should be called wolverines or wolves in sheep's clothing.

Now, Sir, this bill provides that the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, with head office in Winnipeg are to fix the rates—

Mr. ROBB: Fort William.

Mr. DUFF: I thought the head office was in Winnipeg.

Mr. ROBB: No, Fort William.

Mr. DUFF: They are to fix the rates on grain on the Great Lakes. Well, it seems to me, in the first place, that they are not the right people to do it even if it were necessary.

Mr. McMURRAY: Fix the maximum.

Mr. DUFF: It does not make any difference, I said fix the rates. I say the Grain Commissioners are too close to the grain trade to have the fixing of the rates on other peoples property, on vessels which are owned by other people and not by the government who appointed those commissioners. I also want to say that if we are going to have paternal legislation of this kind—and it seems to me we are running mad in the matter of restrictions, regulations and paternal legislation of all kinds—we should also get the Grain Commissioners, or somebody else to fix what should be the maximum price of grain. For instance, we who come from the Maritime provinces and from the province of Quebec and who have to buy flour, may petition this government to fix the maximum price of grain. Why not? If the western representatives and the government think it is necessary to fix the price for the carriage of grain why should it not also be necessary to fix the price of the grain itself?

Mr. FORKE: Does the hon. member not see how absurd that argument is?—and I do not wish to make the remark in any way at all offensive. Does my hon. friend imagine that any combination of farmers is possible in the Dominion of Canada to fix the price of grain in any shape or form? How can my hon. friend make such a comparison? How can he put the farmers in the same position as six vessel owners combining to fix prices for the carrying of grain; there is simply no comparison.

Mr. DUFF: I was not aware that the farmers fixed the price of grain.

Mr. FORKE: You assumed that they did.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, no.

Mr. FORKE: You wanted the maximum price of grain fixed.

Mr. DUFF: When I referred to the western farmers I meant the men who fixed prices in the West. I say it is just as reasonable that the price of grain should be fixed—it makes no difference whether by farmers or the grain exchange at Winnipeg—

Mr. FORKE: You mean the government should fix the price of grain?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I say it is just as reasonable for the government to fix the price of grain in the interest of the Maritime provinces, the province of Quebec, and the province of British Columbia as it is for it to fix the rates for the carriage of that grain from Fort William to Port Colborne, or to Montreal, or anywhere else. I say the principle is bad, and if the government is going to make a practice of introducing paternal legislation, it has as much right to go on and fix the price of everything.

An hon. MEMBER: Fish.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, fix the price of fish, lumber and everything else. I say this is legislation that is not in the interest of the country. I am sorry to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce bringing in a bill to try and fix the maximum grain rates on the Great Lakes.

Now, Sir, if the government want to help the western farmers they can do so without interfering with private enterprise. We must not forget that whether these shipping companies have been charging too high a rate or not, the fact remains that the vessels engaged in that trade belong to those who fix the rates. If the rates are higher than the shipper thinks is justifiable there is no reason why he should use these boats. The government can provide a remedy. The govern-

ment has a remedy in its own hands without interfering with private enterprise. And what is that remedy? We have two lines of railway, one running from Winnipeg to Quebec, and another from Winnipeg to Montreal. I would suggest that if the government wishes to do something in this matter, if it really wishes to help the western farmers, it should reduce the rate on grain carried on the Canadian National Railways from Winnipeg to Quebec and Halifax. That would be the proper way to act in this matter, not to introduce legislation which interferes with private enterprise.

Mr. CALDWELL: Why not lower the rate on the Transcontinental railway to Quebec?

Mr. DUFF: I am not saying they should do that. What I say is, if the government desires to help the western farmer, instead of interfering with private enterprise, instead of interfering with men who have invested, as we have been told, $25,000,000 in building this one line of steamships, it should lower the rates on its own railways. If the government is going to fix the rates for the carriage of grain, or other commodities, on the Great Lakes why should it not do it everywhere else? Most of this grain from the western prairies crosses the Atlantic ocean to the old country, or goes from Alberta to Vancouver and thence through the Panama canal to the United Kingdom. If the western people want the government to fix the rate on grain on the Great Lakes, why not ask it at the same time to regulate the water rates on grain from Vancouver through the Panama canal to the old country? There is just as much reason why it should be done in the one case as in the other, and just as little reason for that matter. The whole principle is wrong. The leader of the Progressive party speaking last night, I think, asked why more ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine were not used to carry grain on the Great Lakes. My information is that some of them did carry a small quantity of grain. Of course those ships can carry grain. The canoes which are used for pleasure on the Rideau canal could carry grain. So could the boats used on the Winnipeg river. But the question is whether or not such a canoe or boat is fit to carry grain from Fort William to Port Colborne and Montreal. The same thing applies to the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The question is not whether they can carry grain, but whether they are adapted to the carriage of grain at a rate that would be profitable.

My contention would be—and I am only saying this for the benefit of my hon. friend the leader of the Progressives—that the Canadian government ships are not suitable for the carriage of grain, they are not equipped for it, and they cannot either load or discharge their cargoes as quickly as the boats which were built purposely for the business. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats cannot carry grain at the same rate that either the American or Canadian boats owned by the other shippers on the Great Lakes can carry it. Consequently it is useless to encourage them to put these boats on the lakes to compete with the other boats. If you encourage them too much they are liable to put some boats in the service and, the boats not being suitable for it, they would lose a great deal more money than they are losing at the present time.

It is said that grain is carried from Canadian ports to American ports cheaper than it is carried from Canadian ports to Canadian ports. How is this bill going to help in that matter? Grain will still be carried by American tonnage or American bottoms from Canadian ports to American ports at whatever rate the owners of the ships desire to fix for the carriage of that grain. This bill cannot regulate rates on the American boats. I understand also that grain is carried in American bottoms from American ports to our Canadian ports of Montreal and Quebec, and certainly this government has no power at all to fix the rates which these boats shall charge for the carriage of grain. It is also a well-known fact that the amount of grain carried by the Canadian boats is very much smaller than the amount carried by the American boats. How is the government going to regulate this matter and accomplish any good to the western farmer, when the great bulk of the grain is carried in American bottoms and tonnage, over which the government has no control. In my opinion this bill will benefit the western farmer very little, if at all, and will have the effect of putting the Canadian steamship lines and other lines on the Great Lakes out of business.

It is quite possible that the Board of Grain Commissioners are experts on grain and also other lines of business; but it is rather a difficult matter for anybody who has not had any experience, and has not the knowledge, to decide how much should be charged by these steamers for the carriage of this or any other commodity. For instance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), approves of the freight rates charged by the steamers which were subsidized by the gov-

ernment. But I venture to say—and I think the minister will admit—that he cannot in parliament to-night say whether in his opinion these rates which the different steamships charge are reasonable or low or excessive. In my opinion, if there is going to be any rate fixing, it is not fair to the owners of these steamship lines that the Board of Grain Commissioners at Fort William should fix the rate at which they should carry the freight. It is a different thing altogether for the Railway Commission to fix freight rates on the railways, and I think hon. members will agree with me. I have heard them protest against rates which were fixed by the present Railway Board. Even the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) protested, and my friends on the other side have told me on different occasions about the way the Railway Board fixes rates. There is a difference between the Railway Board fixing rates and the Board of Grain Commissioners fixing rates for this reason: That the Canadian National Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway as the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said are really monopolies, because they run through certain territory, and nobody else can do business in that territory but themselves; therefore the government has a right to control rates. But the Board of Grain Commissioners is not the right and proper body to fix rates for steamship lines. How are they going to know what rates should be fixed? For instance, under this bill the Board of Grain Commissioners will meet some time or other and fix a rate. How are they going to fix it? What are they going to base the rate on? To show the silliness of the whole business, if there is a combine to-day, and if the steamship companies get together and increase the rates, will hon. members tell me they are not going to fix their costs and charges, if they want to? Will hon. members tell me that, when they lay their statements before the Board of Grain Commissioners, they cannot show that commission that they should get certain rates? And the Grain Commissioners are in such a position that they will not know whether their statements are correct or not. I say this measure is not going to help the western farmer, and that the rates under this bill will be just as high, as far as the western farmer is concerned, as they are at the present time. It would be far better in my opinion if the hon. members who are now supporting the bill should say to the government "Get after the combine, if any exists, in regard to the present rates; make the steamships go into competition with one another," because when there is competition there can be no fixing of rates for more than a few days at a time.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member has already said that the Board of Grain Commissioners is not a fit body to say what the rates should be.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say they were not a fit body. I said I doubted it.

Mr. FORKE: That they were not competent.

Mr. DUFF: I do not say that; but go on.

Mr. FORKE: How would they know when a combine existed, if they did not know it by the results, by finding out that exorbitant rates are being charged on the lakes? How would they find out that a combine existed? We only know about a combine when there is no competition and when excessive rates are charged. Who would be the judge to say when the charges were excessive? You have thrown doubt upon the ability of the Board of Grain Commissioners.

Mr. DUFF: I do not know exactly how to reply to my hon. friend. He has said there was a combine. I do not know about that. I am taking his word, and the word of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) that a combine exists. I am saying that some doubt has been cast on these three gentlemen in regard to their ability to say whether a combine exists or not. I am not saying so, but I am told that not one of these gentlemen knows anything about shipping or the cost of operating steamships. I do not know whether a combine exists or not, but I am willing to take the word of the hon. leader of the Progressives, and the hon. member for North Winnipeg. But I do say that you are going to have a combine when you get the Grain Commissioners to fix the rates, because the rates will be all the same.

Mr. FORKE: Oh no.

Mr. DUFF: And I say if the matter is left open, and people are allowed to secure their space as they require it, and bid for the space with different companies, that will break up the so-called combine, and the western farmer and grain operator will have a better chance to get lower transportation rates on the Great Lakes than they will by the operation of this bill. The whole thing is the combine; and the leader of the Progressives and his friends and my hon. friend from North Winnipeg should unite with me

in saying to the government that the combine should be broken up; and if you break up that combine we will not need the legislation proposed to-night which, in my opinion, is bad legislation.

Mr. FORKE: Who is going to prove the combine? Tell us some way to find it out?

Mr. ROBB: Hear, hear.

Mr. FORKE: When can we prove a combine?

Mr. DUFF: I am sure there are certain ways of proving a combine. That is not very difficult. We have proven a combine in connection with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, for instance, on the Atlantic ocean. That was not very hard to prove.

Mr. MARTELL: Under the Combines Bill as passed through this House this session, is it not possible for any person who has reasonable cause for believing, and who will state on information that he has reasonable cause for believing and does believe that a combine exists, to have that combine investigated? I think that is the whole tenor of the Combines Bill, which was put through this session.

Mr. PARENT: Has it been sanctioned?

Mr. MARTELL: We must hope that it is going to be sanctioned. We have as much reason to hope that it will be sanctioned as we have to hope that this bill will be sanctioned.

Mr. DUFF: I agree absolutely with the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell), that anybody who has a reasonable belief—

Mr. FORKE: Six persons.

Mr. MARTELL: It would not be difficult to get six persons out west, if they thought so.

Mr. DUFF: Exactly. There is no difficulty to prove a combine. What this government should do is to get after the combines or profiteers under the act which the hon. member for Hants cited. I am satisfied, from the speech of the leader of the Progressive party, and from that of the hon. member for North Winnipeg, that there is a combine. I say that a combine has been proved with regard to insurance rates, if the statements of my hon. friends are correct. If it is true that the Canada Steamships Company or their agents or officials or anybody else, refuse to give space in their steamers to shippers of grain, unless they insure with them at double the rates which other companies charge, that is proof that it is time to get after them under the Combines Bill, and to show them that they cannot do that sort of thing any more. But this government has no right to fix rates on water carriers any more than to fix rates on anything else. That is not Liberalism, and it is the height, and the worst kind, of protection. I am surprised to see my hon. friends from the West who want lower tariffs, and who believe in free trade and Liberal principles, coming to parliament and asking for protection, when it suits themselves to do so. I should like to know who asked for this legislation, because in looking up Hansard and reading the debate which was introduced in this House by Mr. Armstrong, I notice that amongst other hon. gentlemen who spoke against legislation of this kind, was the late Minister of Railways and the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). In the speech of the latter hon. gentleman, I notice that he read a letter from the Montreal Corn Exchange Association. I need not read it, but it refers to a speech made by Mr. Armstrong, and they say:

> The committee of management of this association earnestly hopes that you will use your influence towards procuring the rejection by the House of that bill....
>
> It is needless to recapitulate them—

That is the reasons why they oppose the bill.

> —here further than to say that, in the interests of the grain trade via the port of Montreal, the continuance and growth of which is of such vital concern to the port and indeed to the country, it is important that water carriers be left free to make such rates as market conditions may warrant from time to time, and that grain shippers may be, in the future, as they have been in the past, in a position to take advantage of the lowest rates they may be able to secure by negotiation with the water carriers.

I presume the Montreal Corn Exchange Association are users of large quantities of space or tonnage in ships on the Great Lakes. It seems to me that the opposition coming from them is worth while considering. I cannot believe that it is in the interest of shippers to have this legislation go through. I feel that if there is open competition, and if this combine which is alleged, were broken up, there would be no necessity for this legislation, and in fact, whether the combine is broken up or not, this legislation should not pass this House. No case has been made by the minister himself, or by other hon. members who have so far spoken, to prove that fixing of rates will be beneficial to the western farmer in the shipping of grain. I, for one, protest against the passing of this bill, and I say that it should not go into effect.

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

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. ROBB: Before proceeding with the consideration of the clauses, I wish to make some observations out of courtesy to my hon. friends the preceding speakers. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) made reference to the Armstrong bill introduced at previous sessions, and I am frank to admit that I am opposed to the Armstrong bill, but the Armstrong bill was quite a different measure from the one under consideration. Admitting, however, for a moment, that it was not a different measure, conditions to-day and conditions existing last season, were quite different from conditions that prevailed at the time the Armstrong bill was introduced. I have under my hand the rates for the seasons from 1913 to 1922. For instance, in 1913, the average rate for the season from Fort William to Port Colborne, was 2.43 cents a bushel, and the average rate to Buffalo was 2.43 cents a bushel. In 1914, the average rate to Port Colborne was 1.48 cents a bushel, and the average rate to Buffalo was 1.63 cents a bushel. In 1915, the average rate to Port Colborne was 1.71 cents a bushel, and the average rate to Buffalo was 2.63 cents a bushel. Let us come to 1922, and we find that the average rate to Port Colborne was 3.81 cents a bushel, and the average rate to Buffalo was 4.49 cents a bushel. But during the months of May, June, July, August and September, there was a discrimination ranging from three-quarters of a cent to one and one-half cents a bushel against the Canadian ports. The change in the rate to Buffalo was because at that time the port at Buffalo became congested.

As regards the two measures before the House running concurrently, the measure just passed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) and this measure, the real teeth of the legislation are in the bill passed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We found very little opposition to that measure; it went through. But the opposition to this bill is because this bill provides the government with the information which they must have in order to consider intelligently the situation in suspending the coasting laws. I respect the opinions of my hon. friend from Lunenburg because I know that he is a shipping man with considerable experience in all departments of the business. I am sure that he is perfectly competent to speak upon all shipping questions, and I gather that he is fully aware of the importance of this matter. The importance of this measure does not consist in the fixing of a maximum rate; we find the importance of it, the teeth of it, in the gathering of the information, the tabulating of it, the publication of that information, and the publication from day to day, during the season, of the space that has been booked and the space that is available for shippers. That is where we find the very teeth of this measure; and it is in that respect that it is opposed. It is opposed not because there happens to be in it a clause that gives the board the right, if they deem it wise, to fix a maximum rate, but because the measure provides machinery upon which the government can act intelligently and arrive at a decision that will justify the suspension of the coastal laws.

Mr. FORKE: I do not see any provision in either of the bills enjoining the board to report to the government in regard to the abrogation of the coastal laws. The government will have to secure information and it seems to me that the board would be the proper authority to secure it. It would therefore appear necessary to incorporate a provision to that end in either of the bills.

Mr. ROBB: As we proceed with the bill my hon. friend will observe that a part of the duties of the Board of Grain Commissioners will be to advise the minister from time to time concerning conditions. Of course, they will be in a position at any time any complaint comes in to supply such information as is found necessary. The coastal laws are themselves a question of international importance. Would it be right to confer upon a commission the duty of recommending their suspension? The government of the day must take the responsibility; and the government that had the courage to bring in this measure will not lack the courage to suspend the coastal laws if that is considered in the public interest.

Mr. GOULD: I had intended asking the minister a question but he has anticipated it.

Mr. MARTELL: Do I understand the minister to say that the Board of Grain Commissioners, who know absolutely nothing about shipping, will be charged with the duty of advising the government in regard to the suspension of the coastal laws, to allow foreign ships to come and ply between one Canadian port and another?

Mr. ROBB: The preceding government and this government have both taken the re-

sponsibility of allowing, at certain seasons, United States vessels to come into Canadian ports.

Mr. MARTELL: You could always do that.

Mr. ROBB: We have the right to give a permit for that purpose, but we have not the right to allow foreign ships to ply between one Canadian port and another.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the minister propose to create a law permitting foreign vessels, either American or any other, to ply between one port in Canada and another? If that is the intention I must protest against it. The minister is very much older in politics than I am, and he no doubt is aware that this matter of permitting vessels other than Canadian or British to ply between various ports within Canada has always been a very vexed question with our people.

Mr. ROBB: It is a vexed question to-night.

Mr. MARTELL: In days gone by governments have been memorialized and pamphlets circulated in protest against such permission. It was always pointed out that trade would follow the flag, and Norwegian and other vessels, it was stated, were driving our own ships from our own seas. If the minister proposes to pass any laws by means of which foreign vessels can come in and ply between different Canadian ports in competition with our own vessels, then I will vote against the bill.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend apparently has not been in the House all evening. My colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), to-night amended the Shipping Act along these very lines to enable the government to suspend the coastal laws in certain waters during certain periods if necessary, for instance, in connection with the carriage of grain on the upper lakes.

Mr. MARTELL: Surely that cannot refer to the Atlantic seaboard, because if it did I can tell the minister that few members from Nova Scotia would support it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It covers the Atlantic as well.

Mr. MARTELL: Well, it should not be done.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend knows that there is no intention to apply it there.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The power is general.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes; of course, it must be.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Interpretation—"Board".

Mr. MARTELL: Does the minister say that the members of the Board of Grain Commissioners are qualified to deal with shipping matters? It is all very well to establish a board at the city of Winnipeg, but these men can know absolutely nothing of shipping, which is a peculiar branch of trade. It is almost impossible to estimate what the costs will be. You may insure your vessel, or you may not get insurance at all. In other words, you are governed to a very large extent by the waters in which you are engaged and by the elements, so that it is absolutely impossible for anyone living in an inland city like Winnipeg, unless he has been a seaman brought up on the shore and has been engaged in the shipping business all his life, to be able intelligently to advise upon the various questions that may arise in connection with the shipping business. The more I see of this sort of thing the more it strikes me that there is growing a tendency towards paternal legislation; and by and by there will be no such thing as private enterprise in the country at all. If this continues men will be loath to invest their money in any industry, particularly in the shipping industry if it is to be subject to governmental control; because there is no business which is more at the mercy of fortuitous circumstances of various kinds than is the shipping industry. I do not see why there should be any desire on the part of governments to interfere with the law of supply and demand; and in this particular instance, with regard to the shipping business, I cannot see wherein this interference can be justified. There are so many peculiar hardships and risks to be encountered in the shipping industry, which are not to be met with in any other business, that under the best conditions a man is circumspect in any investment he makes in this direction. But when the industry is to be controlled in this manner, when shipowners are not to be allowed to hire their ships at the best rates they can secure, it will certainly tend to discourage enterprise. I am firmly convinced that the best course in this connection would be to leave the matter to the law of supply and demand. I certainly think that it is an absurdity for the government of a country to step in and dictate what rates shipowners shall charge for the carriage of certain cargoes. This session we have passed through parliament an Anti-Combines Bill which provides that any six persons who have reasonable and probable cause for believing that a combine exists may lay information accordingly and have the matter thoroughly investi-

gated by a commission; provision being made for punishment, if the case is proved, of those who constitute any such combine, or those who are accessory either before or after the fact. Now we are giving power to a board to fix rates. So with respect to shipping combines this Anti-Combines Bill is apparently intended to be ignored by the minister in the belief that it is worthless. I voted for that measure, believing it was in the interests of this country to regulate combines and restrict unlawful combinations in restraint of trade. But here we have the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) admitting that he has no faith in the bill put through this House by the government of which he is a member.

Mr. ROBB: Not at all.

Mr. MARTELL: Well, that is the only reasonable inference to be drawn. We have the minister endeavouring to restrict all sorts of private enterprise and initiative. I claim that the sooner we get away from this paternalism the better it will be for the Dominion at large. It is all very well for my friends from the West to come here and prate day after day and night after night about their grievances. We all have grievances. We in the East are just as hard hit in regard to our local interests as are the people in the West, but we do not come to the government and expect it to be a fairy godmother and legislate against every private industry in the country in order that our particular grievances may be set right. We are prepared, as the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) aptly expressed it, to stand upon our own legs.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the hon. member be willing to apply the same rule to our protected industries?

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend is getting into the question of protection versus free trade. I am just as much a low tariff man as is my hon. friend, but I have sense enough to know that we cannot do away with tariffs to-day and have sufficient revenue to run the country. I declare to-day that a tariff for revenue is absolutely essential because our people are not prepared to bear any more direct taxation. Now, my hon. friends from the West, who know absolutely nothing about shipping, who do not know the stem of a ship from the stern, the rail from the keel, or larboard from starboard, come here and ask the government to introduce legislation to kill the shipping industry of the country. I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that the government has been so lax as to listen to the importunities of these men in their endeavour to place upon the statute books legislation intended to build up western Canada, or to remedy some imaginary grievances of the West, at the expense of the shipping interests of the Dominion. We of the Maritimes are shipping people, and, as I said before, are prepared to stand upon our own legs, to give fair treatment to every industry in the country. But in the name of everything that is fair, if we believe in this Anti-Combines Act, why do we not allow it to operate in this instance? The act contains full power for the regulation of shipping rates or combines. If it is workable, and I believe it is, then in the name of Heaven let us get away from this paternalism and work out our destiny ourselves without constantly coming to the government and asking it to be a sort of fairy godmother to us.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I quite agree with most of what my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Martell) has just said, but I am afraid it will be very ineffective in this committee to-night. If hon. gentlemen would take the time to study the bill and appreciate all that is involved in it, it would have very little sympathy or support from them. When we come to control rates we get into the biggest problem the human mind can grapple with. I doubt very much if hon. gentlemen have given to this question the amount of consideration it deserves. It cannot be treated in a cynical fashion and laughed at as if it were not important. It is important. It would not be possible, I believe, to make this legislation apply in my province of Nova Scotia, nor in New Brunswick, nor in Prince Edward Island. Our people would not submit to it, no matter who approved or supported it. It would not be possible to get a hundredth part of one per cent of the population of the Maritime provinces to support such a proposition as is contained in some of the clauses of this bill. I have in mind particularly the references to rate control, which is price control. But I rise especially to call the attention of the minister to paragraph (d) of the interpretation clause:

> "Lake and river navigation" includes all the rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada.

I want to make sure that this legislation is not going to extend beyond a certain area. I turn to section 3 and I see that the words "by lake or river navigation" are imported into the section. Just what the effect of this will be I do not know. I thought this bill was expressly limited in operation to the area of the Great Lakes, but "lake and river navigation" is capable of a very wide definition, and is made applicable to "all the

rivers, lakes and navigable waters within Canada." It is possible to read into section 3 the meaning that while the filing of rates with the Board of Grain Commissioners is specifically applicable to those shipping companies that "carry grain for hire between Fort William or Port Arthur and any other port or place in Canada or the United States," it is also applicable to the hauling of grain between Montreal and Halifax, St. John or Sydney.

Mr. ROBB: How?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): By reason of the definition given to the words "lake and river navigation." I call the attention of the minister to this. I do not know what suggestion to offer at the moment to make the meaning clear.

Mr. DUFF: Subsection (d) of section 2 distinctly states:

"Lake and river navigation" includes all the rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada.

In other words as the hon. member for Halifax says, the Board of Grain Commissioners may attempt to fix the rates not only on the St. Lawrence river but on every small river and stream in Canada.

Mr. EVANS: I did not mean to say anything on this bill, but after the insults thrown out by the member for Hants (Mr. Martell), and after what the member for Halifax has said, I can hardly forbear to enter the discussion.

Mr. DUFF: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that some members had thrown out insults in regard to this matter. I submit that the hon. gentleman is out of order and should withdraw this remark.

Mr. EVANS: I abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but when a reflection is cast on our intelligence and on the class we stand for, I take it as an insult.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: Withdraw.

Mr. EVANS: In the discussion—

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I ask for your decision.

Mr. EVANS: On this lake rate discussion—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fortier): Every member has fully explained his position, and I do not think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. EVANS: In the discussions of this Great Lakes question we are faced with the same problem this year as we had to deal with last year in connection with the railway rates—the same, indeed, as we had before us this year in regard to the banking question so far as rates of interest are concerned—where the laws of supply and demand are set aside as having nothing to do with the question. The part of western Canada—

Mr. MARTELL: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that in connection with the railway rates question the law of supply and demand should be set aside? If so, would he apply that principle to questions of tariff and trade?

Mr. EVANS: The hon. gentleman will have the floor later.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend cannot answer.

Mr. EVANS: The part of Canada particularly interested in this bill is the agricultural part, the part adapted to the growing of grain and the raising of live stock—an ever-growing industry. Agriculture on any considerable scale commenced only with the advent of the railroad somewhere about 1885. Since that time the agriculturist in that part of the Dominion has had a continuous fight against the protected interests of this country. We have practically no industrial concerns in western Canada, and the organized interests of eastern Canada have taken advantage of our position in that regard, with the result that all the earnings of our people have gone east and have not been used for our benefit; the greater our earnings have been the greater has been the bondage we have laboured under. I say now the time has come when we can no longer stand the elimination of competition among all with whom we have to do in the way of distribution of commodities, the public utilities, and so on. The lake freight question is only one of others, but it is a case in point to show how our position has been taken advantage of; it is a marked factor in increasing the cost of production to a point where we can no longer compete with our products in the world's markets. Two or three years ago one of our farmers' companies, in an effort to keep down the cost, tried to go into the export business for at least a part of their grain, but we found ourselves up against one of the most complete and ruinous combines that ever existed in this country as regards shipping and insurance on the Great Lakes. It was not until the last crop moving season that the situation became unbearable.

In order that we may have some conception of what actually took place in the fall of last year and that we may have some figures before us for the purposes of comparison, let us consider for a moment what were the rates that previously prevailed. In 1914 the average rate to bay ports was 1.46 cents and in 1915, one rate went as low as .69. In 1914 the average rate to Montreal was 11 p.m. 4.58 and in 1915, 4.22. In 1921 the rates of Canada Steamship Lines to bay ports were as follows: Up to September 3, 2¼ cents; September 9, a contract was entered into at 3 cents; September 24, 2½ to 2¾ cents. On September 30 they reached 3 cents all round and stayed at that the rest of the season, except that at one time in November the rate went up to 3½ cents. Mr. Playfair, with a lifetime of shipping experience, chartered a boat for the whole season of 1921 to bay ports at 2½ cents. In January, 1922, Canada Steamship lines contracted with the Armour Company to carry to bay ports 1,000,000 bushels at 2 cents and 2,000,000 bushels at 1¾ cents, and later in the year they contracted to carry wheat from Chicago to Montreal at 7½ cents. Now let me quote some of the rates prevailing in November, 1922: November 21, to Port Colborne, 8½ cents; November 18, to Montreal, 13 cents; November 12 to Montreal, 13 cents; November 7, to Montreal, 15½ cents. There is one case on record where the charge to bay ports and Goderich was 11 cents per bushel; that was on November 4. There was also one case on November 3 of a rate of 9¾ cents to bay ports. No cause was shown why the rate should be higher than in the corresponding months of the previous year, when 2¼ and 2½ cents were the prevailing rates. There was some complaint as to the difficulty in getting the right grade of coal, but the situation in that respect does not seem to have been greatly different from that of former years. The fact remains, Sir, that all our public utilities are owned and operated by interests entirely outside the areas where the bulk of our grain is grown. Any undue charge in this respect always rebounds on the farmers of the plains; whether it is the cost of the distribution of commodities or the handling of our surplus for export—wheat, cattle, dairy products and so on—we are charged for the service a price out of proportion altogether to the cost of rendering it. If some way is not soon found whereby the western farmer will be able to sell his own products, agriculture is going to dwindle in that part of the Dominion until it becomes a thing of the past; or it may be that the bitterness already existing and finding vent in other ways will lead to some untoward movement that will operate with a velocity which may endanger the very structure of confederation itself.

The privileged interests subsidized by this government and the politicians have always maintained the policy of having all the trade of this country go east and west. They have done this for many years now, and as far as the agricultural products of western Canada are concerned they have been successful. But it has been a different tale as regards the raw product of the manufacturers; they prefer getting what they need for their factories anywhere else than in Canada. This is the point I want to make. Since the government has followed a policy to this end, the people in those remote parts have a right to expect that all the facilities for the moving of their produce, all the public utilities that we need to use, should be so regulated as to the prices charged as to encourage us to follow that policy. But instead of that, after the fetters of bondage have been placed upon us the mad dogs of privilege are let loose upon us and no one seems to be able to call them off. It will surely take some explaining, Mr. Chairman; why our vessel owners follow the practice of discriminating in favour of American ports and American shipping. They have carried wheat from Chicago and Duluth to Georgian bay ports, Port Colborne and Montreal, at from one to two cents a bushel less than the rate from Fort William to the same ports. Why they should charge a rate from Fort William to Port Colborne 50 per cent higher than that which is charged from Fort William to Buffalo is rather hard to understand. I say it is time that the traffic on the Great Lakes was thrown open to all the competition possible. There is no longer any reason why Canadian steamship companies should be assisted by any coastal laws to go out of their way to help our rival and keen competitor, the American farmer, to beat us.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Receiving and tabulating of such charges.

Mr. GOULD: I should like to ask the minister if he would accept a recommendation from the Board of Grain Commissioners if in their opinion they deemed the time opportune for the cancellation of the coasting laws?

Mr. ROBB: We are asking the Board of Grain Commissioners to assemble the information that will enable us to decide.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Monday, June 25, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

Mr. McMASTER (Brome) moved concurrence of the House in the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh reports of the committee charged with the investigation into agricultural conditions.

He said: These reports have been on the Table of the House for some days, and it is my desire now, with the unanimous consent of the House, if I may obtain it, merely to move formally their adoption, and to defer any remarks I may have to make until I see whether there is any criticism offered in connection with these reports.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to postpone until to-morrow what he wishes to say in regard to these reports. Notice can be given for to-morrow.

Mr. McMASTER: I bow to the ruling. I give notice that to-morrow I will move the adoption of and concurrence in these reports.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN—CATTLE EMBARGO

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not observed that the order is yet down which called for the correspondence respecting the cattle embargo. I would think that all the objections the minister could have to bringing down the correspondence would be over to-day about five o'clock. Perhaps, we could expect it then.

Mr. FIELDING: Seven o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps we can expect it this evening.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was not aware there was any objection to bringing it down. We have been busy getting the files ready. They required a good deal of sorting. I think they are all ready and some of them are now in my office in this building and I will be ready to submit them to my hon. friend this afternoon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When the file comes down we will see how much it is that requires the government four months to sort out.

UNITED STATES LIQUOR LAWS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I call attention of the government to a despatch from Washington which, no doubt, all hon. members have read, to the effect that a communication has passed from this government to the United States intimating an unwillingness to comply with a request that had been made for co-operation in the prevention of shipments of liquor against the law into the United States. Would the government intimate what correspondence has been sent from Washington to this government and from this government to Washington on the subject?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am obliged to my right hon. friend for bringing up the matter, because, having read the despatches to which he refers, I think they are calculated to create an entirely erroneous impression. It is true, the government has received from Washington a communication asking if it would be possible for the Canadian government to assist in promoting the observance of certain liquor laws of the United States. The communication relates to matters particularly appertaining to the export of liquor. When the communication was received it was referred to the departments of government concerned. The reply sent to Washington related exclusively to a statement of the law as it stands and the position of the Canadian authorities in meeting the request that has been made. There has been nothing sent forward to Washington with respect to the government's policy in the matter of endeavouring to co-operate with American authorities in securing observance of their laws. So far as the government's policy in that matter is concerned, I would say that we have every desire to co-operate with the American authorities in helping them to secure the observance of their laws in precisely the same manner as we would hope to have the American authorities co-operate with us in securing the observance of our laws. Such action as has been taken up to the present has been entirely of a departmental character. The government is sending a communication to Washington intimating that, as soon as the present session is over, we will be pleased to receive at Ottawa an officer from the American government to discuss with our officials possible ways and means of helping to meet the situation to which they have referred. Our attitude in this matter is entirely a friendly one, in an endeavour to fur-

ther, so far as it may be possible for us so to do, the best of relations with our American neighbours.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did the request come? And, was there not time to receive the American delegate so that the government's policy might get beyond the bounds of desire and into legislation? I noted that the Prime Minister stated that they had taken care that the delegate would not come until the session was through, when it is impossible to put any more legislation on the statute books for another year. When was the request received and why was action not taken before?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The request was received some little time ago. When it was received, it was referred to the departments of government concerned, and I think such delay as has taken place has arisen out of the circumstance that legal opinion had to be given by the law officers as to the position of the law, and the extent to which it would be possible to go under the law as it stands in meeting the situation as presented to us. My impression is that it was about three months ago, the request was received. There was no intention of delay in the matter. It was dealt with entirely departmentally. As regards the larger question, that of policy, the government would like to be able to view all sides of the situation before taking final action.

THE UNION BANK

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave, under rule 39, to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, to call the attention of the House to certain statements appearing in the press, apparently of an authentic nature, regarding the financial position of the Union Bank of Canada; and the necessity of safe-guarding the public interest in every possible way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to move the adjournment?

And leave having been granted:

Mr. SPEAKER: Might I remind hon. members of rule 39, paragraph (c) which reads:

> The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session.

I merely wish to call the attention of hon. members who might desire to speak on the motion, that they must speak strictly to the the motion.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to keep to the motion as closely as I possibly can, although I realize that it will, perhaps, be a little difficult to deal with this matter without in some way alluding to what has been taking place in this House and in different committees for some time past. The House has only passed the third reading of the Bank Act renewing the charters for another ten years, and now the affairs of one of our large chartered banks has been made public, and the people are made aware that the bank has suffered some losses, so that, perhaps, it is in the public interest that this question should be discussed to some extent at the present time.

A statement has been made by the president and directors of the Union Bank of Canada. I may say that for some time back there have been persistent rumours in the country that all has not been well with some of our banks. We have heard this in the corridors of the House, and I have heard it mentioned in other places. We are assured by an examination of the bank's affairs by auditors, president, directors, and an independent high official of the Bank of Montreal, that the Union Bank is in a fundamentally sound position. It seems strange, though this may be only a coincidence, that just immediately after the third reading of the Bank Act had passed this House, the statement was made public. This may have been only a coincidence, and just happened; but on the face of the matter, it seems rather strange that this should have taken place. I have no wish by word or act of mine to do anything that will in any way throw doubts or cause uneasiness in regard to the position of the Union Bank of Canada at this particular time. I want, however, to call the attention of the House to a statement issued by the Union Bank of Canada on November 30, 1922. The statement in part is as follows:

Capital..	$8,000,000
Net profits for the year after all bad debts and doubtful liabilities to the bank are eliminated..	1,131,060
Paid in dividends up to date..	800,000
Balance of profits carried forward..	483,000
Rest account..	6,000,000

I am sure everyone must have considered that to be a most reassuring statement. The bank was prosperous, everything was going well, and no one had any reason to believe, even as late as November last, that anything was wrong. We have another statement issued just the other day. The capital remains the same, $8,000,000; the rest account has now shrunk to $1,750,000, and the

profit and loss account is only $159,360. What has happened? A sum of $4,250,000 has disappeared from the rest account of the bank. We are told that this has been withdrawn from the rest account, and placed in the contingency reserve account, presumably to cover up losses that have occurred in the bank's business during those months. The business of the bank has suffered losses from high officials of the bank. The president's statement is that this was through unauthorized transactions in sterling exchange. That is the explanation we get. I said previously that this all becomes public after the bill renewing bank charters for ten years had passed its third reading in this House.

Another question might be asked. There have been persistent rumours, as I have already stated, and the condition spoken of must have been in existence for months. Had the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or the Department of Finance, any knowledge of the condition of things during the time the Bank Act was before the committee on Banking? It might be worth while to inquire how the losses have been incurred. Have they been incurred by granting loans at branch banks where loans have been made by managers of branch banks at from 8 to 10 per cent interest? We have often heard it stated that a high rate of interest has to be charged in the prairie provinces because the risks there were much greater than in other parts of the Dominion, and 8 per cent and 10 per cent have been named as the rates of interest that had to be charged in order to carry on the bank's business successfully. What is the fact? The losses that have been incurred are not made in the branches, but through loans made at the headquarters of the bank. We know that branch managers are not allowed to make any loans over $500 without applying to headquarters for authority to do so. The facts of the case seem to be that the really serious loans made by banks are made at headquarters and by the general managers. We might say that this is due to rather reckless financing on the part of some of the managers at headquarters; witness the case of the Merchants Bank and the loss at this time incurred by the Union Bank. The thought of many people may be: Have we just escaped another merger? A concentration of one or two banks in one of the financial centres would be a misfortune, something that the Progressive party has been fighting very strenuously against. The Union Bank is the only large bank with headquarters in the West. No one wants to see it disappear; no one wants the control of credit to fall into the hands of a few privileged individuals or corporations, and I believe that this is true of the majority of our people irrespective of their views on banks and banking.

Now, let us for a moment examine some of the occurrences of recent date in banking circles. We will take the case of two banks, the Merchants Bank and the Union Bank of Canada. The Merchants Bank suffered losses through bad loans much in the same way, I think, as the Union Bank of Canada has no doubt suffered. Still its capital was intact and it had a rest account of $1,500,000. After certain negotiations, however, it capitulated—shall I say?—to the Bank of Montreal in which it was swallowed up. This, of course, resulted in a loss to its shareholders, and inconvenience and hardship to many individuals. And now, there remains of that institution no more than a name,—a name, I might say, "to point a moral or adorn a tale." The Union Bank of Canada, the one more immediately under discussion, like the Merchants Bank of Canada, has its capital stock still unimpaired, with a rest account of $1,750,000. These are almost parallel cases you may say, and you naturally ask the question, why so different a conclusion? To the ordinary layman outside, there does not seem to be very much difference between the respective positions of the two banks, and one naturally wonders why the ending is not the same in the one case as it was in the other. Well, the Union Bank has shown courage in the situation in which it finds itself. I think it may be commended on its courageous facing of the facts and its taking the people into its confidence. It has set its house in order, having learned from experience that the policy it has adopted is the best under the circumstances.

Now, we are told in the statement made public that there is to be a policy of economy in operating and overhead expenses. I believe I heard that same statement made not very long ago when it was declared that all the banks in Canada were running at a minimum of expense. It was stated that no reduction could be made in the matter of operating and overhead expenses, the banks apparently, as one would infer, being already run as economically as possible. Yet here we find a bank to-day making the public announcement that it will inaugurate improvements in this direction. It must be perfectly evident to a great many persons, I should think, that the operating and overhead expenses of banks to-day are much too extrava-

gant in the present condition in which the country is struggling. There have been some dismissals, and perhaps this is well. I want to pay a tribute to some of the directors who are still on the board of the Union Bank. Personally I am acquainted with some of these gentlemen; they are men of probity, courage and honesty, whose names, I think, ought to be a tower of strength in restoring confidence in the stability and the fundamental soundness of the Union Bank of Canada. I have no desire for a moment to cast any shadow of doubt on the soundness of this bank. True mistakes have been made, but the right course has been adopted, and the bank deserves the support and confidence of the public in view of the courage with which it has faced the situation. But what assurance have we that the same thing may not occur again? I anticipate the probable reply, that you cannot prevent men from taking chances and doing foolish things, that you cannot make men honest by any preventive measures; honest,—shall I say?—with other people's money. Well, that does not make for stability or public confidence and I claim that something ought certainly to be done to ensure the public against any disastrous happenings in connection with the banks, at least, with the authority of any directors. In the light of experience, and in view of the facts that are now made public, parliament, by extending the bank charters for ten years has given the O.K. to things just as they are. Some hon. members may be excused for thinking that it might have been the part of wisdom for this House to have thought carefully over our whole banking system in relation to commerce and agriculture, and in relation to the needs of the common people, before partly committing itself for ten years.

Taking up the newspaper to-day I saw a short report of a speech that had been delivered by President Harding during the course of a tour through the United States. I would direct the attention of the House to some remarks he made on that occasion. He said:

> For the first time in the history of agriculture in any country adequate investment and working capital will be furnished farmers on terms as favourable as those accorded to commerce and industry. The farmer is receiving nothing more than is coming to him, nothing more than he needed, nothing more than was good for him, and nothing that was not also good for all our national interests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word in conclusion. I do not want to cast any reflections upon any bank or banking system at this particular time, but I do not think that the moment is opportune when something should be done to meet the situation that exists in Canada to-day. We have not yet reached a solution of the banking question; it is still open; and it would have been in the best interest of every one concerned if a little more consideration could have been given to this public question in the light of some of the revelations that have come to our knowledge in the last few days. I have just read some of the remarks of President Harding, and I realize that in this House there is a very different attitude towards the trouble of agriculture from that which was evident long ago: it is true we get a good deal of sympathy. But sometimes it is thought that those who represent the agricultural interests are sectional in their outlook on things and do not take a wide enough view of conditions as they generally prevail throughout the country. Here is President Harding making the statement that in the United States agriculture is of national importance and that anything that helps the industry must be for the general welfare. How much more is this true of a country like Canada whose great basic industry is this same agriculture? I repeat, therefore, that all our banking and our commercial interests should be viewed in their relation to the interests of agriculture in this Dominion. I do not desire to detain the House any longer, but I hope that nothing will be said to-day that will be regarded as casting any doubts on the fundamental soundness of the Union Bank. Its managers have taken the proper step, but mistakes having been made in the past, I think something should be done to obviate a recurrence of them.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): If I am to keep within the compass of the ruling laid down by you, Mr. Speaker, as to the nature of the present discussion, I am afraid that I cannot follow my hon. friend (Mr. Forke) in the consideration of the recent address of President Harding. President Harding's notions of what is good to help agriculture do not happen always to be in harmony with our own. For example, he thinks that one way to help agriculture is to put an enormously high tariff against the Canadian west, and so I am not disposed to regard him as a high authority on matters of that sort. I am unable to see the connection, if there is any, between the Bank Act and the present affairs of the Union Bank of Canada. If all that we know about the affairs of the Union Bank had been before us from the beginning of the session, I fail to see what bearing it would have upon the amendments to the Bank

Act. I would welcome, even at this eleventh hour, any useful suggestions that might be offered by way of amendment to that act; and the act, let me inform my hon. friend, is not yet absolutely through parliament. At this moment, it is before another branch of parliament, and if hon. gentlemen feel interested in any question touching the Union Bank trouble, if they will frame some reasonable amendment dealing with the matter, I am sure that even to-day hon. gentlemen of the Senate would be willing to consider it.

My hon. friend asks two questions. First, he wants to know whether the information concerning the Union Bank was in the possession of the Minister of Finance before the Bank Act passed. Yes; and under what circumstances I will tell him. He also asks the question, what assurance have we that this thing may not be repeated? I can tell him that we have no assurance, and so long as human nature is as it is we cannot have any assurance, that misfortunes may not occur to any bank. We cannot guarantee the banking skill nor the moral character of any banking officials. Do not let us run away with the idea that we can make men moral, in the matter of banking, by act of parliament. Men will always receive positions of trust, and if they betray that trust or display bad management in the execution of it, we can only regret the weakness of poor humanity. My hon. friend, however, asks a more important question: Did we know anything of this trouble of the Union Bank when the Bank Act was still before the committee? I personally knew about it, yes; and I will tell my hon. friend the circumstances. About a month ago the president of the Union Bank, Mr. Allan, sent a special messenger to me from Winnipeg. He brought a return of the last month's operations of the bank. He filed that return in accordance with the law, and the messenger, speaking for Mr. Allan, said, "While the president files this return, and while it is in accordance with the statements in the books of the company and is correct in that respect, he feels anxious. He is not himself satisfied with the return. He finds a condition has arisen which calls for investigation. He is not prepared to make a definite statement now, but he believes the bank has suffered losses which need to be accounted for in a different manner from that indicated in the return." He was kind enough to ask my judgment and advice as to what should be done. I told him the only advice I could presume to give, although probably it was not necessary, was for him to have a thorough investigation into the affairs of the bank to ascertain the exact condition; that if losses had been incurred, his proper course was to ascertain them as absolutely and definitely as possible, and then come before the public and make a frank statement of the whole situation. Mr. Read, the auditor, who brought the message to me, intimated that that was exactly what was in the mind of the president and directors of the bank. He told me their officials were making an inquiry into the bank's affairs and intended to call in the expert of another bank to confirm, if necessary, their judgment.

They reached a conclusion and in due course a statement was made to the public. The only communication I received at that time is the one which I shall now read. As I said, Sir, the message came to me by special messenger from Winnipeg, President Allan did not come himself but sent the auditor, Mr. Read. On June 5 I received the following letter from Mr. Allan:

Dear Sir,

As you will remember a verbal statement was made to you on my instructions by Mr. E. S. Read, the auditor of the Union Bank of Canada at the time of the filing of our April statement with your department to the effect that while the statement was correct according to the books of the bank, I had reason to fear the existence of losses the extent of which I was unaware of: that as a consequence I had instituted a revaluation of the Bank's assets, the result of which was not then known but which it was feared might necessitate the deduction of a considerable sum from the Rest Account, and that our April statement was filed in your department subject to the outcome of that revaluation. Its completion has been delayed beyond the date anticipated but I expect that within ten days or two weeks I shall be able to intimate the result to you and that our statement for May will be prepared in accordance therewith.

I am, Sir,

Yours sincerely,

W. R. ALLAN,
President.

Now, I have every reason to believe that the action of the president and directors of the Union Bank of Canada was in accordance with the advice that I ventured to give them—indeed, my advice was not necessary, they had already undertaken to do this. The statement has been issued to the public and the House is familiar with it. I commend the action of the president and directors in the course they took. When they discovered there were losses beyond those for which they had made provision, they had courage to face the music, to make an investigation, to ascertain the exact extent of the losses, to make reasonable provision for those losses by writing down their assets, and then to come before the country with a full, frank statement. In that way, I believe, they have deserved and have won the confidence of the country. I have no reason to doubt that the Union Bank is in a sound and strong position, and

again I congratulate the president and directors upon the courage they have evinced.

Beyond this I do not know that I have anything to say regarding the Union Bank of Canada. This is the whole story.

Motion (Mr. Forke) withdrawn.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 221 (from the Senate) respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Hudson.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 223 (from the Senate) for the relief of Jessie Anne Epstein.—Mr. Duff.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GRAIN DOCKAGE

Mr. McKILLOP:

1. If dockages are all binned together and terminal elevators clean that which belongs to them, how do they deliver to the purchaser the quality which they themselves (the elevators) receive?
2. Is it possible to obtain sample from the inspection department representing quality of dockage used by inspectors when grading dockage shipped and as shown by inspector"s test as provided for in the tariff?
3. Who determines the standards by which inspectors inspect and grade dockage for which no standard has been set by the Standards board?
4. What provision is made for the inspection of spelts and mixed grain?
5. In case of dispute can survey be held on spelts and mixed grain?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Terminal elevators are required to deliver all screenings free from domestic grain other than broken wheat, and to deliver to the owner of said screenings what would be considered a fair average of original screenings after separation of domestic grain is made.

2. No. It is not possible to obtain sample from the Inspection department that would represent quality of dockage, as the Inspection department do not grade dockage; but it is possible to obtain sample from the Inspection department representing quality of dockage covering any particular shipment after same is loaded.

3. There are no standards set by the Standards board covering dockage. The only standard which the inspectors use is that defined by the Seed Commissioner for "Standard Re-cleaned Screenings."

4. No provision is made for the classification of spelts, but dockage would be assessed if not reasonably free from weed seeds. No provision is made in the Canada Grain Act for the classification of mixed grain. The following general rules for classification were adopted by the Inspection department for the guidance of inspectors, in Septemher, 1919, and have been in use ever since.

Mixed grain No. 1 shall consist of a mixture of wheat and oats, with wheat predominating.

Mixed grain No. 2 shall consist of a mixture of oats and wheat, oats predominating.

Mixed grain No. 3 shall consist of a mixture of wheat and barley, or barley and wheat.

Mixed grain No. 4 shall consist of a mixture of oats and barley, or barley and oats.

Other mixtures of grain, such as wheat and rye, or rye and wheat, are classified as such.

5. A survey could not be held on spelts as there is no provision for classification. A survey could be held on mixed grain.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY:

1. Does the government propose to introduce legislation to amend section fourteen of chapter thirteen of the statutes of 1919, "An Act to incorporate Canadian National Railways Company and respecting National Railways," which provides that the provisions of The Railway Act respecting the operation of a railway (as distinguished from the provisions of such Act respecting the construction or maintenance of a railway) shall apply to such Canadian Government Railways as would but for the passing of this act be subject to the Government Railways Act, during such time as the operation and management thereof is entrusted to the company?
2. Why are the construction and maintenance thus excluded?
3. Is it the intention of the government to introduce a measure to amend the said section with a view to removing such exception?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The government does not intend to introduce any further railway legislation this session.

GRADE THREE POST OFFICES

Mr. WHITE:

1. What revenue must a post office have to become a semi-staff office or a grade No. 3 post office?
2. What post offices in Ontario have such revenue?
3. What post offices in Ontario having such revenue are semi-staff offices and what grades?
4. What post offices in Ontario having such revenue are not semi-staff offices or are low Grade No. 3?
5. If any, why are they not so graded or classified?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING (for the Postmaster General):

1. (a) Semi-staff offices discontinued on April 1, 1918.

(b) Grade 3. Change from Grade 1 and 2, (that is, Revenue Offices), to Grade 3 and up (City Offices) is not decided entirely upon revenue. Population and local conditions are also most important factors. Under present

conditions population 12,000, revenue $25,000 are working guides, but final decision is a question of adequate public service.

2. The offices in Ontario with a revenue of $25,000 and over are: Barrie, Belleville, Brantford, Brockville, Chatham, Cornwall, Fort William, Galt, Guelph, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener, Lindsay, London, Niagara Falls, North Bay, Orillia, Ottawa, Oshawa, Owen Sound, Pembroke, Perth, Peterborough, Port Arthur, Renfrew, St. Catharines, St. Thomas, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, Smiths Falls, Stratford, Sudbury, Toronto, Waterloo, Welland, Windsor, Woodstock.

3. None of the above mentioned offices are semi-staff offices. The grades of the various offices are as follows:

Office	Grade
Barrie	2
Belleville	4
Brantford	6
Brockville	4
Chatham	5
Cornwall	3
Fort William	5
Galt	2
Guelph	5
Hamilton	8
Kingston	6
Kitchener	5
Lindsay	4
London	8
Niagara Falls	5
North Bay	3
Orillia	2
Oshawa	2
Ottawa	9
Owen Sound	4
Pembroke	2
Perth	2
Peterborough	6
Port Arthur	5
Renfrew	2
St. Catharines	5
St. Thomas	5
Sarnia	5
Sault Ste. Marie	5
Smiths Falls	3
Stratford	2
Sudbury	2
Toronto	11
Waterloo	2
Welland	2
Windsor	7
Woodstock	4

4. Offices with revenue of $25,000 or over which are lower than Grade 3 are the following: Barrie, Galt, Orillia, Oshawa, Pembroke, Perth, Stratford, Renfrew, Sudbury, Waterloo, Welland.

5. The reasons the offices mentioned in Question 4 are not graded higher than 2 are:

Barrie—Population not sufficient. (Letter carrier delivery already given).

Galt—Preliminary arrangements already made for change in status. (Letter carrier delivery in operation).

Orillia—Office under review.

Oshawa—Arrangements already made for change. (Letter carrier delivery already established.

Pembroke—Letter carrier delivery already established. Change of status under review.

Perth—Not sufficient population.

Stratford—Preliminary arrangements already made for change in status. (Letter carrier delivery already established).

Renfrew—Not sufficient population.

Sudbury—Not sufficient population.

Waterloo—Not sufficient population.

Welland—Not sufficient population.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL

Mr. McBRIDE:

1. What is the total amount which the Trent Valley canal has cost the Dominion of Canada to the most recent date convenient to the department?

2. What are the amounts of this total cost chargeable to:—(a) Construction; (b) Interest during construction and since; (c) Maintenance and repairs; (d) Operation?

3. What is the amount and kind of traffic which has passed through the Trent Valley canal in the last ten years respectively?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $23,367,848.22.

2. (a) Construction, $19,027,762.21; (b) Interest during construction and since (no interest has been charged on the cost of construction); (c) Maintenance and repairs, $3,203,099.81; (d) Operation, $1,136,986.20. total, $23,367,848.22.

3. The following is the traffic statement:

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS, TRANSPORTATION BRANCH, OTTAWA

TRAFFIC ON TRENT CANAL

—	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922
Number of Vessels	3,666	3,647	3,433	3,495	2,969	3,549	13,594	5,568	5,222	*3,687
Vessel Tonnage	217,081	174,647	172,780	165,486	142,979	172,133	55,895	160,721	153,115	145,635
Number of Passengers	99,162	85,218	82,391	104,736	93,599	98,437	101,561	97,849	100,049	80,574
FREIGHT	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons
Barley	11					152	32	12		
Buckwheat								6	50	
Corn							4			
Oats	98	24	2	4		109		13	80	16
Rye			25	42	48	6	39			
Flax										
Peas	15	6			14	30	1	5	53	
Wheat	1,128	369	1,764	2,552	1,026	1,401	2,011	1,656	1,192	1,119
Flour	116	80	34	23	22	45	33	17	13	11
Hay	207	88	23			71	34	8	11	23
Other Mill Products	180	133	104	87	43	21	124	38	23	24
Fruits and Vegetables	3	4	16	31	21	30	12	56	6	31
Potatoes	82	91	22	27	17	26	38	88	36	1
Live Stock	156	271	243	215	169	229	165	150	126	67
Poultry, Game and Fish										
Dressed Meats	3	2	2	12		3	1			
Other Packing House Products			2	16			1			
Hides and Leather	2									
Wool						1				
Animal Products (all other)	137	63	52	55	51	31	21	26	39	2
Agricultural Implements	50	29	19	20	38	38	35	86	23	21
Cement and Bricks, Lime	739	430	170	696	224	59	514	73	299	634
Household Goods and Furniture	81	145	54	172	146	45	127	66	113	19
Iron—Pig and Bloom	10	9	5	12	7	10	2	10	24	6
Iron and Steel (all other)	13		83	4	3	2	1		60	
Petroleum and other Oils	44	88	42	54	13	30	62	30	74	72
Sugar	17	15		24	11	11	7	1	1	7
Salt	33	2	2	6	1	2	2	5		1
Wines, Liquors and Beers	16	14		10		2	23	19	3	5
Merchandise—Not Enumerated	1,411	2,311	2,376	1,778	1,941	2,075	1,724	1,646	1,600	1,462
Pulpwood	29,639	21,966	14,868	13,777	13,764	18,346	15,553	7,460	15,802	5,556
Sawed Lumber	2,202	2,760	1,571	1,556	1,806	4,926	5,404	9,397	3,467	6,173
Squared Timber	1,144	237	419	201	277	253	7,974	4,117	3,028	1,011
Shingles	129	86	131	184	80	65	182	48	230	70
Other Woods	17,698	37,424	27,586	23,123	28,883	35,777	19,966	28,444	17,328	22,770
Hard Coal	129	78	116	81	114	134	45	64	94	56
Soft Coal	238	285	136	117	105	891	77	88	100	119
Coke	2									
Copper Ore		4		2		15		1		2
Iron Ore										
Other Ore	67		37							
Sand, etc		701		128	100	57	739	32	372	3,752
Grand Total	55,800	67,715	49,904	45,009	48,924	64,893	52,953	53,660	44,247	43,038

*Number of pleasure craft through locks in 1922—2,533. Pleasure craft included in 1921 and previous years

MR. W. R. LITTLE

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Was Mr. W. R. Little, Chief Inspector of the Department of Immigration at Quebec, last year, at the time of the mysterious escape of Little George who was sentenced to be deported?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

FRANCOIS D'AMOURS

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the mail contract held by François d'Amours, of Trois Pistoles, Quebec, cancelled? If so, why?

2. Were tenders called for a continuation of the mail carriage service at Trois Pistoles, Quebec?

[Mr. Graham.]

3. If so, how many tenders were received by the department, by whom were tenders submitted, and what was the amount of each tender?

4. To whom was the contract awarded?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING (for the Postmaster General):

1 and 2. Representations having been made that a better service could be given at a lower cost if public tenders were invited, steps were taken to invite tenders with a view to ascertaining the cost of a new contract for the Trois Pistoles Rural Route No. 1.

3. The following tenders were received: Joseph Therriault, Trois Pistoles, $445; Thomas

D'Amours, Trois Pistoles, $450; Joseph Therriault, Trois Pistoles, $550; Chs. Eugene Larocque, Trois Pistoles, $625; Xavier Gagnon, Trois Pistoles, $650; Elizee Rioux, Trois Pistoles, $696; Jean Leblond, Trois Pistoles, $700.

4. As the contract held by Mr. Francois D'Amours involved payment at the rate of $665 per annum, the Postmaster General acted upon the provisions contained in the contract authorizing him to annul the agreement on three months' written notice to the contractor whenever, in his opinion, the public interest shall require it, and awarded a new contract to Mr. Joseph Therriault, the lowest tenderer, at the rate of $445 per annum.

WATERHEN LAKE DRAINAGE

Mr. KNOX:

1. What is the total cost of the Waterhen lake drainage project up to the present time?
2. How much of this was expended on survey work?
3. What is the estimated amount yet required to complete the scheme?
4. How many acres of unproductive land, not including wild hay land, will be rendered arable?
5. Have any experiments been carried out to determine what the soil is best suited for to produce?
6. What disposition will be made of these lands?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Total cost of Waterhen Lake drainage project to 31st March, 1923, $164,887.62.

2. Expended on survey work, $16,716.86.

3. Estimated amount required to complete scheme, $30,000.

4. Approximately 11,000 acres.

5. The analysis of soil samples taken from the bed of the lake shows that the soil is very rich in plant food and suitable for the production of farm crops.

6. To be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Reclamation Act.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—COAL

Mr. HANSON:

1. What was the value of the coal purchased from the United States by the Canadian National Railways including all routes or systems embraced in its operation, in the following fiscal years: 1920-1921, 1921-1922 and 1922-1923?
2. How was the amount distributed among the various units of the Canadian National system?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Passed as an order for return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no reason in the world why this question should be passed as an order for return, and I ask the government to reconsider the matter. The answer to the first question can be given in three amounts; the answer to the second question would not be half an inch long. To have it pass as an order for return simply means that the government is shifting it past this session.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difficulty is that we have not at headquarters the information asked for. We shall have to get it from all the different entities that go to make up the whole system.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, one present member of the government two years ago stated what the expenditure had been the year before – pledged his fidelity, pledged his word of honour; so he must have known it then. I do not see what difficulty there would be in getting information as to the amount purchased. It cannot affect the management now; it is all past and gone.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difficulty is the time it would take to get it. However, I am willing to let it stand as a question, and we will see what we can do with it.

Question stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

CLOSING OF SOLDIERS' HOSPITALS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all reports, letters, telegrams, and other correspondence relating to the closing of soldiers' hospitals Euclid Avenue Hall Toronto, and Brant House, Burlington, by the government.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONSTRUCTION

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 234, respecting the construction of Canadian National Railway Lines.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this bill has very recently come down and I have not had an opportunity of studying it in detail. As to the construction of the lines contemplated by the legislation I do not wish at the moment to raise any objection. But I do not want the second reading to pass without a protest against one feature of the legislation, a protest which I can carry into committee, but which I want to enter now because in my judgment it does affect in some degree the principle of the measure.

In this bill, as I read it, the Governor in Council will be able to guarantee bonds of the Canadian National Railway, thus pledging the credit of Canada to such bonds as may be issued. By following this procedure the government will not come before parliament and ask for an appropriation in the estimates in the regular way, either for the provision of money direct or by way of guarantee. Hitherto the plan followed has been to include in the estimates the amounts representing the credit of the country, so far as it goes, extending to the road. This is only right: the nation should know, by one complete and clear statement, what the annual commitments are. We have been accustomed to getting that information from the estimates, and I am opposed to any scheme to submerge our commitments in some separate bill, thereby making impossible a fair comparison of the estimates of a given year with those of previous years. As I have suggested, I do not rise to object at all to such construction as may be deemed to be necessary; I rise to protest against the plan of the measure as introduced, enabling the administration to appear to be diminishing or contracting estimates when in fact they are not doing so. Why is clause 5 in the bill? Why does the government not have the matter dealt with in the regular way so that comparisons can be made and the country can know, from the production of the estimates for each year, what it faces in the way of expenditure and commitments for the next year? On a previous occasion, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will remember, I urged that the estimates should show separately and distinctly what was intended to be provided in cash and what by way of guarantee, and the Minister of Finance approved of the suggestion and promised to endeavour to work it out. I think that rule should apply to the estimates. Hitherto the entire vote, whether by guarantee or by express appropriation in cash, has been included in one item or two or three different items, the guarantee and the cash not being distinguished. Nevertheless, we knew what the country's entire commitment was. On the other hand, if this bill passes, a large portion of the country's obligation for the year to come will be hidden away under the covers of this legislation and will not be disclosed in the estimates for the year.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, the provision of money for public undertakings by legislation rather than by yearly estimate is not at all uncommon; I think I could refer to several statutes of the same kind. One of the difficulties in this: Amounts passed each year in the estimates get through, say, in June; no money is available for work until after the session, and in the ensuing autumn very little can be accomplished. The bill states the entire estimated cost for three years, and when any of the railway estimates are up in the House, anything done or left undone in connection with this legislation can be discussed. Take the good roads movement: a certain bulk amount was voted for a number of years, but that did not deter the House from discussing in detail the—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was the amount not provided for it in the estimates each year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount was not in the estimates; the discussion this year took place on the salaries of the officials. Under the statute the appropriation of that money was spread over a definite term of years; so it is in this case, except that we are dealing with railways, not highways. The purpose of the bill is not to hide anything or to keep anything from parliament; it is merely to enable the practical working out of the projects without delay. By this legislation the House says to the Canadian National Railway Board: Proceed for three years, up to a certain limit, in the construction of railway lines. As to the other point which my hon. friend had in mind, and concerning which his remarks were perfectly true, a portion of this expenditure would be by guarantee and a portion by direct vote through legislation, but by section 3 I think it is any lines of railway connecting with the government railways can be delivered by order in council to be government railways and be constructed out of the consolidated revenue. So there will be a distinct cleavage through the orders in council between those to be guaranteed and those to be paid out of consolidated revenue. I can assure the House that it is merely for the sake of expediting the construction that the legislation is brought down in this way. There will be no effort to hide any amount, only it is an amount for a three-year period instead of one year.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): My experience is that railway subsidies, which are almost akin to this appropriation, are always voted separate from the estimates, so I think there is nothing unusual in this.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)

would like some explanation from the minister of this vote for providing money. I know that provincial governments when they guarantee the bonds of railway companies have always had this difficulty, that the bonds brought and always have brought a lower price even though with a government guarantee than they would if they were the direct issue of the government itself. That must obtain here, and I fail to see why something should be lost on the sale of the bonds when, after all, it is the credit of Canada that is at stake. The country must pay it, and I do not see why we should sell in a lower market when we can sell in a higher by making the bonds a direct obligation on the country. That is all I want to say regarding that.

Despite some criticism I have seen in my province I think that the proposition, if it is carried out, of practically crossing New Brunswick with a railway will ultimately be a good thing, not for the southern portion of New Brunswick, but for the extreme eastern and central portions, and looking at it from the provincial standpoint I regard it as an excellent thing. I cannot understand, however, why it is not accompanied by the taking over of the St. John and Quebec railway and the completion of that line, which would give the government a network of railways over the province and relieve the province of a national undertaking which was imposed upon it because this parliament had cut the Transcontinental railway across New Brunswick in a place where it would be useful to no one, never has been useful and never will be useful, and a fertile section of the province was left without railway connection which is absolutely necessary. The province has to-day a very heavy load, a quarter of a million dollars a year, and it would be easy in a programme such as this for the government to take over that road and make it function along with the others.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I take it that this being a three-year programme for the railways, it is all we are to expect for a three-year period. In the first place, I think that the government ought to let us know what this year's programme is going to be and give us some idea how many of these things are going to be dangled in front of certain constituencies and not going to be gone on with. Let us know what railway construction is going to be done. This bill, as I see it, is a very convenient bill for my hon. friends from more than one standpoint. In the first place it gives them a larger bunch of carrots to wave than they otherwise would have, and they like that.

In the next place, when we get down to an entirely different system of book-keeping in connection with the railways, it is going to be difficult for the House to institute any methods of comparison one way or the other. Indeed, apart from any matter of comparison, it is going to be difficult for the House even to keep track of what is going on. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways did point out that there were two distinct classes of credit that would be used by the railways, there is the consolidated fund, and there is borrowing. So far as consolidated fund payments are concerned they would have to stand in a different position, he said, and I presume he meant they would have to be voted just as they are now. But if the House is to have the satisfaction of getting some part of the definite particulars in connection with the annual vote, I would have thought it would have been better that the House should get them all.

Then again—I suppose we can deal with this when we are in committee—it looks to me as if the bill was drawn in such a way that irrespective of votes the treasury in some way or other was to be opened to the railways under this bill merely looking to a subsequent repayment out of other loans. I do not know whether that is a point that has been considered by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, but I do not believe if he has considered it that he is going to agree with it.

4 p.m.

Speaking to the principle of the bill, this being a three-year programme I would like to know if it means that the government have closed their eyes for a period of three years to other requests for railway construction work. Is this the government's programme for three years? I would just like to point out one thing in this connection and that is that the government as the owner of the railways, in addition to the position it occupies as such owner, having regard to the necessary construction to be done in order to enable the business of the country to be carried on, is also obligated contractually to certain construction. It is obligated in certain sections of this country, not by contractual relations I admit, but by work already done and by statements already made it is practically obligated to construction. Some of the items in to-day's bill of fare are obligated in that manner. I mean obligated by partial construction, by representations, and by people going into the district on the faith of the work that has been done and on these

representations. They are mixed up with a three-year programme, and I think that the government ought to let us know whether these works that have already been started and on the faith of which people have gone into the country are going to be given the right of way in this three-year schedule.

Again, I point to the other class of construction, the class of construction that the government is bound to do as a matter of contract. I am going to mention in the first instance, and it is quite enough for my purpose, the viaduct in Toronto. There is not a single word of that in this three-year programme—not a word. I want to remind my hon. friends of this, Mr. Speaker. Speaking from recollection it is now something like eleven years, ten years at any rate, since the contract was signed to build a viaduct at Toronto, but so far the city has been unable to get anything whatever from the government. Last year a deputation waited upon the government, which very courteously promised serious consideration. Well they have got nothing yet, except that "serious consideration." I did not know this matter was coming up to-day. I am again speaking from memory and subject to correction, but my recollection is that on the faith of that agreement the city of Toronto has spent upwards of $26,000,000. The minister will correct me if I am wrong. I have no doubt these reports were made to him.

Mr. FIELDING: By whom was the agreement signed?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was signed, Mr. Speaker, by the only people who could at that time sign it.

Mr. FIELDING: Not the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was signed by the officials of the Grand Trunk and the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In so signing that agreement the officials of the Grand Trunk, as well as the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway, bound their shareholders, whose shareholders are this government to-day. The government is absolutely bound, just as much as any other shareholder, by the signature of the executive. The signature is there and has never been repudiated. Do I understand my hon. friend's question to mean that the government to-day desire to repudiate that obligation?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend should state who made the contract. That was all I asked.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the slightest objection. I do not think there can be any doubt as to what the real position is.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member implied that the government made that contract. They never made any such contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no, all I said was that there were certain commitments, that the government, as a matter of contractural obligation—

Mr. FIELDING: Grand Trunk commitments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is the Grand Trunk to-day?

Mr. FIELDING: That is a debatable question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not very much debate about it. Who is running the Grand Trunk to-day? My hon. friend's appointee and his board. He is paying the shot and getting the receipts, and I am glad to see the receipts are increasing.

Mr. BUREAU: Did my hon. friend's appointees not run the Grand Trunk previously?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had started. However, I do not know that we gain anything by running up side lanes. On the strength of this agreement the city of Toronto has spent, again speaking from memory the tremendous sum of $26,000,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What amount of money does the hon. member think the government of this country should spend at this time, to match the expenditure of Toronto?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not going to ask this government to match coppers with my friend, or the city of Toronto, or any one else. I am only going to ask the government whether it considers its obligation as a "scrap of paper" or not, and whether the government can turn around and allow —no, not allow but be a party to, as it was all done as the result of the agreement—this $26,000,000 of other people's money being invested in this way? I do not suppose it is any worse because it happens to be Toronto's money; it would be all the same if it were the money of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Can the government allow this $26,000,000 to be invested on the strength of their contract and then pay no attention to it? I do not think the government want to take that position.

Mr. McMASTER: Is it the idea of the hon. member that the government, having taken over the Grand Trunk in the manner in which it took it over, is bound by all the obligations of the Grand Trunk no matter what they amounted to?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if my hon. friend could give me any other obligation they disavow. But be that as it may. Here the Grand Trunk is working and operating in Toronto under a certain agreement. It is being operated to-day for the benefit of the government and of the country. Is the hon. member serious in thinking that an agreement dealing with the manner in which the right of way is to be looked after, and the protection given and the like, is to be disregarded and no attention paid to it? The thing seems to be entirely preposterous. I am not talking for Toronto only. What is the matter, practically, with the whole of that large part of rural Ontario served by Toronto? Has my hon. friend ever been so unfortunate as to go into the Union Station and have to risk his life on the low levels?

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does he like it?

Mr. McMASTER: I was not unduly alarmed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has always had a good nerve, and he had it with him then. But, speaking seriously, the railways have built a first-class station: it is not being used, and cannot be used until this problem is settled. And my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) has done something; here he is with his three-year programme. And of course, we had a beautiful photograph of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) during the last election in Toronto, and we had a statement in the advertisement for election purposes as to what would happen in connection with the viaduct and other Toronto works. But let that go; let us assume for a minute that there is some possible jusitification for the attitude that Toronto can get nothing. But what about the safety of the people generally? What about maintaining the frightful mantrap the minister is operating in Toronto to-day? Everybody knows that something ought to be done. Is the government not going to make any move in this matter at all? Do they want the people to be driven into a long and tedious lawsuit? Or what do they want? Surely they are not satisfied with the mess things are in in that city. Surely, they do not suggest that, after spending $26,000,000 in order to get a decent waterfront, Toronto ought to pay any more money. Or are we to understand that that would be their idea? Surely, before this bill goes into committee, including as it does a three-year programme, it ought to include the essential improvement I am speaking of.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I do not quite agree with the interpretation placed upon this matter by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), that this constitutes the government's railway programme for three years, because if such were the case, I think a great many sections of the country would be disappointed. I am not familiar with the position of the viaduct matter in Toronto. I am sorry that the hon. member has not given us more particulars as to what has been done in regard to that proposition during the last ten years. If he had done so we might have been better able to judge of the position of matters. But in allowing this motion to carry I am not by any means binding myself to the proposition that this present measure constitutes the government's whole railway policy for the next three years, because other sections of the country require attention. Only a few days ago I called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the situation down in the Gaspé Peninsula. I understand that an official of the government railways is now investigating that state of affairs, which has existed for more than twenty years. I hope that when he has reported progress, after a full investigation, means will be found not to build a new railway because the road is already built, but to provide the service which the public have been clamouring for for many years. I want to give notice that I do not consider that this measure is closing the matter in regard to railway works for the next three years to come.

Mr. J. FRED. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I had intended to postpone my few remarks on this measure until we got into committee, but on account of what the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) have just said, I think probably this is the right place. I, too, would not want to think this was the government's proposal for a three-year period as regards the construction of branch lines in my province. The minister will know there are in Saskatchewan, certain surveys that are not touched upon in the schedule as to have it in this bill.

I wish to refer particularly to a branch line that has been surveyed from Watrous to Swift Current, a branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific. This survey was put through in 1914, and it touches districts that are first class for wheat production, but unfortunately are a considerable distance from existing lines of railways. The minister knows enough about railways and about western Canada to realize that you cannot expect people to go into these districts and to settle there for a great period of time without transportation facilities. A few weeks ago when the minister was named as Minister of Railways, there was great rejoicing in that part of the country. They look upon him as the godfather, at least, of the Grand Trunk Pacific out in the West, and they thought that now he had been made minister, this branch line would be constructed, and that surely he would not leave himself open to the charge of not giving sufficient nourishment to his own child. The minister knows very well that trunk lines are useless without branch lines, and we in western Canada are proud that our branch lines of railway pay. I want to put up this plea on behalf of people in that district.

There is a branch of the Canadian National from Dunblane to a point on the line of the old Canadian Northern near Aylesbury. That line has been surveyed for some time and no mention has been made of it. There is also the branch line from Yorkton, 25 miles of which have been built to a point named Willowbrook. Neither of these has been touched upon in the bill. Like the hon. member for Bonaventure, I hope this is not the railway board's programme, covering a period of three years.

In making these remarks, and my plea to the minister, I do so in the hope that he will bring pressure to bear upon the president and the board of directors that these lines be gone ahead with. If he will look about his office, he will find petitions there with thousands of signatures, petitions that I have had sent to me from settlers in those districts. Those petitions, as the minister knows, entail a great deal of work. They are not made for play; they are made because there is a great need, and I hope the minister will look into the matter and before another session he will be able to bring down a bill that will give to these people in those districts the railway facilities that they need.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

[Mr. Johnston.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa): With the consent of the House, I beg to move that the following bills from the Senate be now read a first and second time, and be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills:

Bill No. 239 (from the Senate) for the relief of Herbert Hugh Keller—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 240 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nellie May DeBlaquire—Mr. Rankin.

Mr. SPEAKER: By rule 115, such a motion may be allowed if the case is considered to be one of urgent and pressing necessity, in order to facilitate the business of the House before prorogation takes place.

Mr. McGIVERIN: If the rule was observed, it would carry these bills over the meetings of the Private Bills Committee, and in that event they would not come up for consideration at this session. This has been done every previous session in my experience in cases of this kind. If they are read a first and a second time now, they will be referred to the committee and considered by the committee in the usual way.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 239 (from the Senate), for the relief of Herbert Hugh Keller.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 240 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nellie May DeBlaquire.—Mr. Rankin.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONSTRUCTION

On motion of Hon. George P. Graham (Minister of Railways) the House went into committee on Bill No. 234, respecting the construction of Canadian National railway lines, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On Section 2—Power to construct and complete lines described in schedule.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister prefer to discuss the details of the schedules at this stage, or later on?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is immaterial, so long as we do not discuss them in both places.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to ask the minister where the junction point will be between the Hanna-Warden branch and Loverna-Warden branch? Will they both run directly into Warden, or will the Hanna-Warden branch touch the Loverna line at some point south of Warden?

Mr. GRAHAM: The junction point between these two lines will be approximately twenty miles from Warden.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the reason for building the line from Hanna to Warden? Perhaps I should explain to the minister my reason for asking this question. Under the old survey, the line was to run from Loverna to Big Valley, which is at present a divisional point with all necessary water facilities, coal supplies and mines ready at hand. Besides, there are the round-house and the engine shed, and every proper equipment for a divisional point. For some purpose or other the survey has been changed and is now to run to Warden. I want to know the reason.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is mainly to shorten the haul of coal to Hanna and points east.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is it the intention of the railway directors now to change the divisional point from Big Valley to Warden?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is difficult to say just now. We shall need to operate the line first. It may be better to leave it as it is, or it may be deemed wise to make the change. It is a matter of operation.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to protest, basing my protest on my knowledge of the conditions there, against the change of the divisional point from Big Valley to Warden. There is every facility at Big Valley for a divisional point, whereas at Warden there are none of these facilities. You will have to construct everything, drill new wells, build an engine house and a round-house and altogether you will experience considerable difficulty.

Mr. HANSON: I want information with respect to one of the branches which it is proposed to build under this legislation, as it happens to lie wholly within the constituency I have the honour to represent. I am referring to Meductic, New Brunswick, westerly to the international boundary. The Minister, of course, is aware that the government to-day does not own the railway extending up and down the St. John Valley, of which this would be a branch, but operates it under a contract with the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, the stock of which is owned by the provincial government. This, as no doubt the minister is also aware, is not by any means a new scheme, but was originated when the government railways were being operated by Mr. Gutelius; and it was intended to give the railway lines in New Brunswick an independent outlet to the United States, making them independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway to which company all the traffic originating on the government lines in the province of New Brunswick and destined for New England points is at the present time handed over. The arrangement has been commended by railway men of experience who have looked into it. But I want to point out that there are certain considerations which the government, in providing the money for the construction of the line, and the management of the Canadian National Railways in putting their seal of approbation on the project, should bear very positively in mind. The first consideration to which I allude is this, that this line should not be built until it is determined with definiteness, and after the very greatest possible care has been exercised, as to who is to build the extension to the boundary line between New Brunswick and the Maine Central railway. And one question I desire to ask now is, with what connection is this branch line to be yoked up? What railway company, what body of men, are building from the boundary to the Maine Central connection, which I understand is to be some miles west of Vanceboro? If it is to be the company known as the Eastern Maine Railway Company I want to ask the minister to have a care before making any arrangement or entering into any contract with that company. While I would be the last one to do any injury to any promotion of that character in the state of Maine, I have very considerable doubt as to the ability of that company actually to build its lines. I do not think that this branch line should be undertaken until the Canadian National Railway directorate is assured not only of the bona fides but of the financial ability of the parties to build the connecting link that will be necessary. I have heard it rumoured within the last few weeks that the government itself is to build the part that is to lie within the state of Maine. I cannot credit that rumour because no provision has been made here for such work, and in fact I do not think it would be a very good policy. But there are a few other considerations to which I would call the attention of the minister. If the Canadian National Railways are to build the connecting link on this side—and I believe that in the end it will be good business—there are two other things that should be taken into account. First, they should extend the St. John and Quebec Railway to Grand Falls on the Transcontinental as originally contemplated, in order that it may get the business originating in northern New Brunswick; and, in the second place, it should rebuild the railway

bridge of Fredericton which was built by the late Senator Temple, the promoter and owner of the Canada Eastern Railway now part of the government railway system and which is wholly inadequate to bear the traffic of modern locomotives. These two things seem desirable. Another question which I wish to ask the minister is of much importance. Is it contemplated that the work shall be started this year, or is it to be held over until the eve of the next general election? I am very much interested in that question personally, as the minister can very well understand. I will tell him now that it will not get him any votes to hold the matter over another year, while it might get him votes if he started it now. I want him to be sure also that the Maine connection is a bona fide one.

Mr. GRAHAM: The last question in regard to the election is important.

Mr. HANSON: It is important to me personally.

Mr. GRAHAM: The government has no desire, nor has the Canadian National board, to use any of the lines at the time of construction for political purposes. There is nothing of the kind in my mind, because if I were undertaking any of this work for political purposes I would build lines in other places before I would do anything in some of these districts.

Mr. HANSON: What about the Hudson Bay?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not contemplated to do much work this year. We shall do the surveys and twenty-five miles of grading.

Mr. HANSON: Only the surveys this year?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is about all you can do this year the season being far gone already. With regard to the question of my hon. friend concerning the connecting up of the railway with the United States, this branch on the Canadian side is to be constructed only on the distinct undertaking that the line on the other side will be built to meet it, and I think I can tell my hon. friend that the work will not be begun until such time as the Canadian National board has assurance that those who take up the work will be financially in a position to carry it through.

Mr. HANSON: Has the minister information as to who is to build the American end of this line, or is there any definite proposition before the management with regard to it?

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at the present time.

Mr. MANION: The building of No. 6, the Long Lake branch, shortens the distance between Toronto and Winnipeg quite materially, and I have no doubt that freight from the Grand Trunk Pacific can be sent down this branch instead of coming via the head of the lakes, thus lessening operating cost. I have no criticism to offer in this regard. At the same time, there would be perhaps an inclination on the part of the management to switch along this loop the daily passenger train running over the Canadian National via Port Arthur, Fort William, Fort Frances, Rainy River and other points. The section of the Canadian National line to which I refer serves at least one hundred thousands people, and I would urge that very serious consideration should be given before diverting this passenger train and so inconveniencing the people along the present route. If the utilization of the Long Lake branch would improve the passenger service and cut down operating expenses, I do not know that the people at the head of the lakes and the rest of the district would object, but personally I doubt very much if there would be really any saving to the system by diverting this passenger train from its present route. I would suggest to the government that before any change is made they should thoroughly investigate the operating costs and the traffic returns of the train which serves more than a hundred thousand people, because it would be both injurious to that section of the country and to the railroad itself from the financial standpoint if a change of route were decided upon.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is disappointing on looking over the schedule not to find included the extension of the St. John and Quebec railway to Grand Falls. If the minister holds the view that this is to be practically the list of construction for the next three years, I trust that he will draw to the attention of the directors of the National Railways the importance of this extension, for it involves only a few miles of construction and would accomplish more than any similar length of railway that might be built in the near future. Another matter I would draw the minister's attention to is the lack of station accommodation at St. John. Beyond the site there is practically nothing there in the way of a station, and passengers are unprotected from the weather. The people have been very patient regarding this condition of affairs, wishing that perhaps even more urgent works should be undertaken first, but at last they feel that something should be done and that to allow the present condition to continue

is a discredit to the country. The third matter is in reference to conveyor and freight shed accommodation. Such accommodation is required on the west side, and the attention of the government was drawn to this not very long ago. Trade is restricted through insufficient facilities. I would ask the minister to give his attention to these matters.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): With regard to No. 10, "Thunderhill line, northwesterly to Prince Albert branch," will the minister indicate which branch is termed the Prince Albert branch, and what point is to be the terminus?

Mr. MacLAREN: Before replying to my hon. friend, perhaps the minister might give some information on the points I have raised before they escape his memory?

Mr. GRAHAM: I venture to say that my hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) will not let them escape my memory. The extension of the terminals at St. John is being considered by the Railway department in connection with the Public Works department, it being essential from the railway point of view that certain things be done at the harbour, which will make it easier to determine just what ought to be done in the way of railroad terminals. As to the Quebec and St. John railway, it belongs to a private company, and this year the charter was renewed for another term.

Mr. MacLAREN: The line is leased to the government. The completion of these few miles would connect the railway with the Transcontinental. The Transcontinental could build the connection.

Mr. GRAHAM: This railway may be leased to the government, but it is not a government railway.

Mr. HANSON: But you are building a branch from the St. John and Quebec railway to the Maine border, and this branch does not touch the government end of the railway at all, nor the leased line.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is true, but my hon. friend will not object to that. In fact, it looked so good to the people down there that I got a hint from a very prominent man the other day that if that branch were built it was probable that the New Brunswick government would not care to give up the St. John Valley Railway.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think there is a stronger argument for the completion of the St. John and Quebec Railway so that it will connect with the Transcontinental. Has the minister anything to say in reference to increased accommodation—warehouses and so on—for the railway business?

Mr. GRAHAM: That has all been considered by the board. The government would not care to make an announcement concerning these things, as to what ought to be done and when it ought to be done, except on recommendation of the board.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to say a few words in regard to item No. 3 in the schedule, to which reference has been made by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. MacLaren). I am a little disappointed to hear the minister say there is no agreement with the Eastern Maine or any other railway to build their share of the connecting link between the Eastern Maine Railway and the St. John and Quebec Railway. As long ago as 1920 I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways of that day and arranged a meeting between him and representatives of the Eastern Maine Railway and the St. John and Quebec Railway. The then Minister of Railways was very much impressed with the plans that were under consideration. I believe that preliminary surveys had been made and an estimate prepared some years ago of the cost, and the railway men who had it under review regarded the project very favourably indeed. The then Minister of Railways asked the representatives of the Eastern Maine Railway what guarantee we would have that they would build their section of the road in Maine if we built ours. I am speaking from memory now, but I think my recollection is correct. The representatives of the Eastern Maine Railway said: "We will give you better than a guarantee; if you will agree to build your portion of the line in 1921 we will build our portion of it this year; that is, we will do our work one year ahead of yours." So I think that the Minister of Railways or the general manager of the Government Railways should have no difficulty in making an arrangement under which the Maine portion of the road would be built; in fact, I understand that the offer still holds good. As to the completion of the St. John and Quebec Railway to Grand Falls there can be no difference of opinion as to the advisability of taking that step. In fact, that should be the logical outcome of the building of the connecting link mentioned in this schedule, because otherwise you will have to bring the traffic from northern New Brunswick and eastern Quebec over the

Transcontinental to McGivney Junction around by Fredericton—a very roundabout route indeed. The portion of country north of Centreville through which the St. John and Quebec Railway has been projected is without railway facilities, though it is a very fertile and productive farming district, to say nothing of the through traffic that originates on the Transcontinental in northern New Brunswick and Quebec. Another point that has not been touched on is the necessity for the construction of a ten mile section between St. John and Westfield. If we build this necessary connecting link from Meductic westerly to the international bounary to give an outlet to the United States—for that is the object of it—it will be necessary also to build that ten mile section between St. John and Westfield. At present we are paying for running rights over that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have endeavoured time and again, without success, to get particulars as to the agreement under which those running rights are granted; I understand that the charge is fairly heavy, and that is one of the reasons why the deficit on the St. John and Quebec Railway has been so large. I pointed out to the minister a few days ago when his estimates were up that owing to lack of siding facilities, freight which originates on the St. John and Quebec Railway and arrives at West St. John has to go across the reversible falls to East St. John and back. A toll of one and a half cents per hundred pounds each way has to be paid on this freight. Then I believe we pay the Canadian Pacific Railway a switching charge of three cents per hundred pounds, whereas if we had proper facilities on the west side of the river we could do the switching there ourselves. I believe we own the tracks and the docks at West St. John, yet we have to pay the Canadian Pacific to do the switching for us. The member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) tells me we do not own the tracks. Well, that is worse still—we certainly should own them. This situation is most unheard of, and it surely should be remedied in the near future. The connecting link which is now to be built is a project which I have urged on the department very strongly every year I have been here, and I am pleased to see that the work is at last to be undertaken. However, I would strongly urge upon the minister that he consider very seriously the taking over of the St. John and Quebec Railway from the government of New Brunswick. It is the only railway in the Maritime provinces that has not been taken over; it is at present operated under lease by the Dominion government. This road is needed to round out the system of National railways in the Maritimes, especially in view of the building of the connecting link mentioned in this schedule.

Mr. PREVOST (Translation): With your kind permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks relative to item No. 4 of the schedule appended to this bill. In this measure brought down by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), it is proposed to add 995 miles to our National railway system. Of these 995 miles, 856 will be built in the West; this fact has afforded an opportunity to one of our hon. colleagues representing the city of Toronto, to say with a good deal of truth to our western friends, that they would be wrong to doubt our good intentions and generosity towards them, since we are ready to vote them, without any hesitation, a sum of $21,000,000 for railways in which they are specially concerned. Out of the 139 miles in which the East is interested, the province of Quebec is given for its share 14 miles of new railway. I do not rise as a protest against this small proportion allowed to my province, but on the contrary, to rejoice in the fact that the 14 miles in question are all to be found in my home district. Indeed, I have the advantage of living at the entrance of the Laurentian hills, that chain of mountains whose wealth and beauty are, each day, becoming better known. The surest way to get returns from this capital which that mountainous country, rightly called a second Switzerland, represents to us, is to build good roads, construct railways that will facilitate reaching this landscape of indescribable beauty and penetrate into this paradise of tourists. The Canadian Pacific Railway has, for a number of years, traversed the Laurentian hills. The Canadian National previously known as the Great Northern Railway, reaches it also at St. Jerome and extends as far as Huberdeau. However, there has never existed up to now a direct line from Montreal to these beautiful mountains. Notwithstanding that this part of the Laurentides is at least as delightful as the one which the Canadian Pacific Railway crosses, the former contains numerous lakes, magnificent forests and most picturesque mountains. Some of these local places have become famous, namely, the Lake of the Sixteen Islands, comparing favourably with the most beautiful Laurentian lakes; Arundel, Huberdeau, through which the Rouge flows and called "the Garden of the Laurentides," by Curé Labelle, the first pioneer of this beau-

tiful region. The wealth and prosperity of a province contribute to the wealth and prosperity of the whole country; that is why, sir, I consider, that the Laurentides are a national asset for Canada. This part of the country, to-day, is beginning to be better appreciated; the influential press recognizes, describes and praises the charms of the Laurentian hills. For the last twenty-five years, in my own humble sphere, I have praised their most picturesque attractions, highly commended the advantages of the sports to those wishing to settle there, and proclaiming as well their natural wealth, the farming and industrial development of this remarkable region situated to the north of Montreal. The Laurentian mountains have been advertised first, by means of the railway, then the motor car and finally by the building of good roads, and all have contributed in drawing an ever-increasing flow of tourists. The Montreal and Mont Laurier highway started by the provincial government and subsidized by the Dominion Government, is being completed. In a few months, we shall be able to travel from Montreal to Ste. Agathe on an almost perfect road. The latter will, before long, be further extended to Mont Laurier. It is also said that another road will be built in the county of Argenteuil, from Lachute to Arundel, and will join the road connecting Mont Laurier, Ste. Agathe and Montreal with the Canadian Pacific trains already packed with travellers; and the Canadian National, once connected to Montreal, will also have numerous tourists, these together with the improvement of roads, will lead to twice even thrice the number of tourists directing themselves towards the Laurentian hills.

Without ever losing sight that farming, colonization, industry and the development of the ore fields will greatly benefit from the easier and more rapid transportation facilities in a region which contains in its natural state vast wealth and numerous hopes, I wish to especially point out the great benefit that the country may derive from the Laurentides in the way of sport, summer resorts and touring trips, should access to our mountains and lakes be made easier to the lovers of beautiful vistas. It would be a great pity to leave unknown and untouched scenery like that which abounds in the Laurentian hills, to the north of the Metropolis of Canada. We would be displaying an ignorance of the true nature of things if we allowed any further our tourists to transfer to other lands, especially to the United States, millions of dollars each year, owing to our not making easy the means of access to the mountains which are in no way inferior to those of our neighbours to the south in regard to beauty of landscape and abundance of game. With railways and good roads, not only shall we keep in our province Canadians that leave it during the summer season, but we shall draw here hundreds of American tourists anxious to visit our mountains. The mountainous regions in Europe, as well as those of the United States, have become prosperous owing to the influx of tourists that railways and good roads attract to these places. Take as an instance Switzerland; the Adirondacks, the White mountains, in the United States, and many others. What has been done in Switzerland, in France, in the United States, Canada must and shall accomplish. The Government has thrown the foundation of this project; they must persevere, carry it out without delay, and that is what they are doing. Then only will they be in a position to offer to the curiosity and admiration of travellers in this enchanted country, a scenery nowhere else equalled. Indeed, I again state, no country offers a more picturesque concourse of mountains, lakes, cascades and forests filled with game, the whole enclosed in an immense territory offering the most pleasing variety of views, to which the traveller may find easy access, providing railways and good roads are placed at his disposal. There may be found in other parts more lofty mountains, deeper ravines, thicker forests but nowhere will there be found a country more filled with thrills, more serene landscapes, sports easier of enjoyment and a more agreeable sojourn than in these mountains. Along this Laurentian route which stretches from Montreal to Ste. Agathe, by way of the Canadian Pacific, and which, before long, will reach from Montreal to the Lake of the Sixteen Islands and Huberdeau, by way of the Canadian National, along this Laurentian route, I say, which is opening up on stretches of hundreds and hundreds of miles, at times parallel to the river Du Nord, at times skirting sky-coloured lakes, and still at other times winding along a mountain or traversing refreshing forests, one may choose among the most picturesque sites which dot it here and there throughout its length, those that are conspicuous either for their rustic beauty or for their special features more in harmony with each one's taste. A tent is put up, a bungalow or a sumptuous villa is built according to one's inclinations and here is the ideal spot already found to rest and live in peace, far from the worries of strenuous life and close to one's place of business; conditionally, of course, on there being a good road or railway to reach the spot.

By building the 12 miles which appear in the schedule submitted, that is to say, from

Grande-Frenière to Rinfret Junction, in other words, from St. Eustache to St. Jerome, the Government ensures a direct communication between Montreal and these parts which I have just mentioned, a region that is not only one of the most beautiful as regards variety of scenery but which is equally one of the richest in natural resources. In fact, this territory contains immense possibilities in farming, the same may be said of its industry and mining. Lumber of the best quality is to be found there, the dairy industry is highly developed, a number of carloads of cheese are weekly exported via the Canadian National Railway; mica, graphite and other minerals have lately been discovered in that part of the country. In a word, this portion of the Laurentides which is in the county of Argenteuil, is no less beautiful and rich than are the regions which the Canadian Pacific traverses and better known because the trains of that railway reach it directly from Montreal. It is most astonishing that the Canadian National which traverses this enchanted part of the Laurentian hills is not yet directly connected with Montreal. Travellers are forced to travel by the Canadian Pacific, to a junction called Montfort, near St. Jerome, where they change trains to take the Canadian National. It is a serious drawback for tourists. So far as traffic is concerned—and it is considerable—both freight and express trains must pass through Joliette to reach Montreal, that is to say, a distance of 74 miles from St. Jerome. When the projected line from Grand-Frenierè to Rinfret Junction, about 12 miles, shall be built, the distance from St. Jerome to Montreal will only be 30 miles. One may imagine the inestimable advantages that will result from this line both for tourists and traffic, as St. Jerome is the centre through which passes all the traffic coming from the north of the counties of Argenteuil and Labelle, served by the Canadian National railway. Moreover, St. Jerome has a population of 7,000 inhabitants and its trade is considerable. The transportation of products and goods from Montreal to the north or vice versa, at present controlled by the Canadian National, is effected by a 74-mile route instead of 30 which it will be when the branch line in question appearing at No. 4 of this schedule is constructed. The Canadian National is, however, one of the Government railways concerning which we deplore those enormous deficits. Well, I have no hesitation in saying that through the operation of this new line, which will directly connect the north with Montreal, the Canadian National will realize profits that will contribute to diminish, in a small way perhaps, but nevertheless in an appreciable ratio, the deficits that we are bound, though regretfully, to admit. When the Canadian National reaches the Laurentides, by way of the branch line in question, when this link between the Metropolis and the Laurentian hills has been established, this line will give as much return as does the Canadian Pacific Railway in the north. It is more than 30 years since the Canadian Pacific inaugurated its line in the Laurentides. It proved a success from the start. It is ever so long that this branch line has been considered as one of those that give the best returns to that company. The same will be said of the Canadian National, when direct communication between Montreal and the Laurentides has been established.

Mr. Chairman, whoever has at heart the general interest of the country will be pleased to approve of this project which will, at last, connect by a state railway the northern parts of Montreal to the Metropolis. One last word, I hope that all the branch lines appearing in the schedule submitted to us may be as useful and timely as this one.

Mr. GRAHAM: I might say in two or three words that I appreciate the beautiful description of the fine country to which my hon. friend refers. I have been there, and found it a little difficult to get in as rapidly as I wanted to, and difficult to get out rapidly at the particular time I wished to. I think, perhaps, it was late in the evening. Any person who has looked over that section of country will see the disadvantage of the Canadian National Railway in not having a direct connection with Montreal; and while the building of this section to which my hon. friend so eloquently referred would be a good thing for that portion of the country, I am sufficiently hard-hearted to say that I think it will pay real money to the Canadian National Railways over and above all cost of operation.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I wonder if the minister could give me any assurance that the work on the Okanagan branch—No. 27 on the schedule—will be carried forward this year? This branch has now been something like eleven years under construction. I think if ever there was a people who had a right to invoke the proposition that hope deferred maketh the heart sick it is the residents of that district. In conversation with the president and some of the officials of the National Board this year, they very cordially agreed with me when I made the statement that in Canada there would not be a better feeder

for the Canadian National Railway than the Kamloops-Okanagan branch. It embraces one of the most beautiful as well as one of the most fertile parts of Canada; and if the war had not intervened I have no doubt its completion would have been a matter of history several years ago. It must be remembered that, as a revenue producer, a line running through a horticultural section has many advantages over a line traversing a grain-growing portion of the country. Although it may take from thirty to fifty acres to produce a carload of grain, perhaps two acres or less of horticultural land will fill a car with fruit or vegetables. The member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) could speak better than I can from personal knowledge of the easterly end of this section. But coming down a little further towards my own home, we pass through the Falkland and Salmon river district, both of which are capable of great development. In Falkland there is the largest shipment on the continent probably awaiting transportation facilities. In the Salmon river district they have large lime deposits and great timber resources; and the district from that point to Armstrong is a very fertile agricultural district indeed. From Vernon the branch spur runs 16 miles to Lumby, one of the most progressive districts in our country, and the hinterland of that section contains untold wealth in the way of timber and minerals. Down the Okanagan lake to Kelowna it runs through a section that produces about two-thirds of the 5,000 cars of freight which are sent out in the season. It can easily be seen that this will be a great feeder to the Canadian National, once it is in operation. I would like to be able, if possible, to convey to the residents of this district the assurance that they will not have to wait another year before it is completed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to go that far. The hon. member asks the question, and expects me to answer, I suppose. The closing words of my hon. friend's remarks were very succinct. He asks that he be given the assurance that the road will be completed this year. I think he scarcely meant that. The work is going to proceed, but owing to the fact that the season is very far advanced, although there are many miles already graded on that line, it would be hardly possible to finish it this year.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Could the assurance be given—and I think it might reasonably be done—that before another fruit crop is ready to ship, the line will be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that is the hope of the board.

Mr. McBRIDE: Just a word in connection with this line. I do not think the Canadian National line will have a feeder, west of Edmonton, anything like the Kamloops-Kelowna line when it is completed. In my opinion that line, within a year after completion, will not only be paying interest and operation expenses, but it will furnish a good revenue to the Canadian National Railways. There has been some opposition to this road, but no person who has the best interest of the Canadian National Railways at heart has anything to say against this line. Indeed, I think that it is the people who are interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway who are circulating this propaganda that it would be money wasted. The Canadian Pacific Railway and its officials know the amount of freight that road will take from their railway. Not only will it be a benefit to the Canadian National in getting freight, but it will be a benefit to the farmers in the prairies in that it will give them direct connection with the Okanagan. The railway will be able to take grain from the prairies down to the coast, and the same cars can be loaded with fruit on the return trip. It will work both ways, and I would like to see that line completed with the least possible delay.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I wonder if I could recall the minister's mind to the question I asked a little time ago. Perhaps while he is travelling between the Atlantic and Pacific he could rest half-way and give me an answer.

Mr. GRAHAM: What was the question?

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Regarding the Thunderhill branch, which runs northwesterly to a point on the Prince Albert line. I asked him, what branch is termed the Prince Albert branch, and what is the terminus of the Thunderhill branch?

Mr. GRAHAM: Largely the location of the line depends on the possibility of two things, the traffic and the engineering difficulties. This is the information that is given to me. There are four miles of the line graded. We propose to grade 17 miles in 1923 and to lay 21 miles of track. In 1925, it is proposed to lay track on the line for 23 miles at an estimated cost of $368,000, thus completing the line to tie into our Prince Albert main line near Tisdale.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): That, then, is not the survey that was originally made, and that it had been expected would be fol-

lowed in connecting up with the Humboldt-Melfort line?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, it is not.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister give the general route of the Thunderhill branch?

Mr. GRAHAM: The route of that line has not been finally determined.

Mr. HANSON: What is the intention?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have given it as nearly as possible. The line must have been surveyed, because four miles of that particular line have been graded.

Mr. HANSON: The minister has his engineers in front of him, and he might inform the committee what, in general, is the route proposed to be traversed by this line between the two termini.

Mr. GRAHAM: From the present terminus, generally speaking, it takes a northerly direction to Tisdale.

Mr. HANSON: What points does it touch?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that.

Mr. HANSON: Could the minister get that information?

Mr. GRAHAM: We could get the information approximately, but it might not touch those points at all when the final survey is made. It may be impossible to touch the points I might name.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I have no objection whatever to the branch that the minister proposes to run in a northwesterly direction from Kelvington to Tisdale, I believe would be the point. I would like, however, to call his attention to the fact that although that branch is needed there, I do not know why it should be called the Thunderhill branch. I am not sure when the Thunderhill branch was first surveyed. There have been a number of surveys since 1908, and the district between the end of the steel at Kelvington and the point north of Humboldt where it was anticipated that would meet another branch of the Canadian National railways, has been settled, some of it, at least, for fifteen or sixteen years in anticipation that that road would come through. This would seem as if the Thunderhill branch had been abandoned and a new branch has been named the Thunderhill branch. There are two soldier settlements that can well be served by the branch proposed by the minister, and I would not suggest that it should not be built. But I wish to voice a most emphatic objection to the abandoning of the old route which has been surveyed. I do not know the definite route, but it runs generally in a westerly direction from Kelvington to Lake Lenore, or possibly Wakaw.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I am fairly familiar with that country, and while what my hon. friend has said with regard to the western extension of the Thunderhill line is quite true, its construction has been delayed so long that several railways have been built ahead of it. I refer more particularly to the Grand Trunk north to Prince Albert, upon which Wakaw is situated. Then there is the Humboldt-Melfort line, and I think the Canadian Pacific has also a line in there somewhere. Therefore, there was no necessity for extending this line through the original route, for the reasons I have indicated. Accordingly, they have swung north and tied up with the Prince Albert line near Tisdale, connecting up those large soldier settlements The change was unavoidable on account of those developments.

Mr. LUCAS: Was the minister able to give any consideration to the request I made a few days ago when this matter was under discussion on the resolution, in regard to the reinstatement of the Bruederheim line in this schedule?

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought I answered that pretty fully the other day. I pointed out that there were many lines on a tentative list, but there were altogether too many to be undertaken at one time. The Canadian National board was asked to revise its list, and the line to which my hon. friend refers, in not in the latest list. Some hon. gentleman has asked me if this means that nothing is to be done during the next three years except the lines mentioned in the schedule. Parliament is supreme every session to do as it pleases, and each case has to be dealt with on its merits. But the government thought it a wise thing, and I think the House and the country will agree, that the lines the board think the most pressing to be constructed, should be proceeded with under a three-year programme. That does not, of course, tie the hands of parliament at any time.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister think that remark would apply to No. 2, the Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch, a line of 67 miles of railway proposed to cost $3,500,000, a line that has been promised more by political candidates in Nova Scotia than any other line of railway that I have ever heard of. What is the justification for spending $3,500,-

000 in building a line from Sunny Brae to Guysborough? The minister must know, if he knows anything, and his officials must know, if they know anything, that that branch line could not pay on such a large capitalization. All the lumber produced in the Guysborough district is freighted by water. There is a good harbour there, and the people who own the large limits there would never consider freighting the lumber out by rail when they can get it out by water. Water navigation is available all the year round. What is the justification for this branch line, and is it proposed to let a contract for it next year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Tenders were asked for the construction of that line many years ago.

Mr. HANSON: That is right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It never got further.

Mr. GRAHAM: It never got further, because another line that had no greater justification was constructed right away in the same district.

Mr. HANSON: What branch would that be?

Mr. KYTE: Halifax-Musquodoboit.

Mr. HANSON: That is not in the same place.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, but it was in the district of my good friend the then Prime Minister. It was constructed. I did not, however, suggest this line. The board suggested this line to me without any suggestion on my part directly or indirectly, as all the lines were recommended to me. I think they must know what they are about. The purpose of this line is to open up the local territory for the lumber industry and to provide better facilities for agricultural products, as well as to give direct communication to Guysborough for its fishing and allied products. On part of the route there is considerable agricultural development and quite extensive hardwood forests which the railway will make it possible to develop. I might say that originally the line was intended to be so constituted as to become the main line. Under this construction, it will not be so extensive, but it can eventually become the main line. The other line has some grades that would have to be eliminated for heavy traffic.

Mr. McISAAC: To hon. members of this House who have been in the last two or three parliaments, the Guysborough railway question is a very familiar one; but as there are many hon. members present who were not in the last parliaments, perhaps I should take up a few moments in explaining the question. I think the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) is one of those in the present House who should receive some information in connection with the matter. In the session of 1910, this resolution was passed in this House by both of the then parties, Conservatives and Liberals:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived in the commercial and industrial development of the province of Nova Scotia, when the Intercolonial Railway of Canada should be extended into the non-railway counties of the eastern section of the province.

I am of course interested in this matter and probably it will be considered that anything I say in behalf of the interests of Guysborough must be more or less exaggerated. But I can tell the House that the county of Guysborough has never had any railway except the service of a few miles in the extreme northeastern section of that large county. This is one of the largest counties of the province, extending along the sea coast from Halifax county down to the strait of Canso a hundred and fifty miles, all consisting of the best fishing grounds that are to be found in the whole Dominion. The fishing business is undeveloped because there are no facilities; and the timber limits in the county are quite extensive. These resources would contribute traffic to a railway for very many years to come, and in addition the agricultural districts of the county are second to none while the undeveloped mineral resources of Guysborough have great possibilities.. But apart from all these, I would mention particularly the fact that Country Harbour in this county is one of the best harbours in the world. I see my hon. friend from York laughing.

Mr. HANSON: I was not laughing.

Mr. McISAAC: Well, the hon. member was smiling at any rate. But I do not want him to take my word on that point. I will read from Hansard a speech delivered by Sir Robert Borden in the session of 1910 with reference to this very subject. At page 1182 of Hansard of that year Sir Robert Borden is reported as follows:

> I passed along the shore of the county of Halifax to the county of Guysboro last summer. I travelled altogether about 500 miles through districts not served by railways at all, and where railway development would mean a great deal to the people and lead to considerable development in that little province. I can tell the Minister of Railways—

The present Minister of Railways, (Mr. Graham) was minister then too.

—a great many things I saw, I could speak of a great many districts where railway facilities might mean a great deal to the people, and might lead to very great progress and advancement in that little province. I saw, in the county of Guysboro,—

I would ask the hon. member for York (Mr. Hanson) to note that.

—just across the line from the county of Halifax, one of the most splendid harbours that can be found anywhere in the world—Country Harbour. This harbour stretches back 10 miles from its mouth, with water close up to the shore everywhere from forty-five to sixty feet in depth, landlocked twice, and with a splendid roadstead outside where, in almost any weather, ships can ride in safety—and have ridden in safety—without going inside. And in what condition did I find the place? Not more than a dozen families are living around that harbour. There was no railway development, no opportunity for commerce, and the fishermen had gone to the adjoining Isaac's Harbour or Fisherman's Harbour, for the reason that these smaller harbours would subserve their purposes better than this magnificent Country Harbour of which I have spoken. All along that shore are opportunities of development. The people of Hailfax county, and those of other counties in the province of Nova Scotia to which allusion has been made, have, it seems to me, fairly good reason to complain that their interests in respect of railway development, have not been properly attended to in the past.

He concluded:

This is no time for hesitation and vaccilation. Make up your mind—and I hope you have made it up in the direction I have indicated then give to the Intercolonial railway the branches, feeders, extensions which would be given, if it were owned by any of the great railway corporations.

That is what Sir Robert Borden had to say on this subject in 1910. The House unanimously passed the resolution and in the year 1911 the government called for tenders for this very road covering a distance of 67 miles. At the same time, they called for tenders for another road in the county of Halifax extending from Dartmouth eastwards to Musquodoboit. These tenders were called for at the time of the election of 1911, but unfortunately for the government, and for the county of Guysborough, and Canada as well, the Liberals went out of power and the Conservatives came in. What happened? The government of Sir Robert Borden cancelled the proposed contract for this particular railway in the county of Guysborough and proceeded with a railway in that gentleman's own county. Well, I suppose he was perfectly right in going on with a railway in his constituency, but I say that it was unfair to cancel the contract for this railway, simply because a Liberal was returned to represent the county of Guysborough. That was in 1911 and nothing has been done since in connection with this matter. The question was brought up year after year by the representative of that constituency, Mr. Sinclair, while the Conservative party was in power. When Hon. Frank Cochrane was Minister of Railways, he returned the same answer to Mr. Sinclair on every occasion, that the government was looking into the matter, and hoped to build the Guysborough railway at an early date. The work however, was never undertaken and I have every reason therefore at this time to congratulate the present Minister of Railways, on the step he is about to take. I brought the matter to the attention of the late Minister of Railways, Mr. Kennedy, the first time I saw him on his only official tour of the province of Nova Scotia. I represented to him the rank injustice that had been done the county of Guysborough in ignoring for so many years its undoubted claim to a railway. That honourable gentleman promised consideration of the claim of Guysborough, but unfortunately he did not live long enough to bring the matter before the House. So that I am more than pleased to congratulate the present minister on his dicision to carry out the recommendation of the board to give to that county a railway to which it is entitled and of which it has been deprived for so long.

This line will be a splendid feeder to the Intercolonial railway. In 1911 before tenders were called for, another branch line known as the Sunny Brae branch from Ferrona to Sunny Brae a distance of 12 miles, a completed road, was purchased by the government of that day from a private company. The sum of $100,000 was paid by the then government for this branch, and in addition to that they spent between $85,000 and $100,000 in surveys. This was all done in 1911 for the purpose of extending the road from Sunny Brae to Guysborough to connect up with Country Harbour, which as Sir Robert Borden himself stated is one of the best harbours in the world. It is open the year round, and if this branch line is extended to connect up with it the result will be a shortening of the distance to European ports. I have heard hon. gentlemen on the Progressive side speak of the advantage of the Transcontinental railway down in Quebec, because it shortens the distance by about 200 miles in the shipment of freight from the West to the seaport. This would shorten the distance still further by about 50 or 75 miles. No branch of the Intercolonial railway was ever built that would prove of greater benefit not only to the county it will serve, but also to the railway generally, for this railway besides providing much-needed facilities for Guysborough would also be a great

feeder to the Canadian National Railway, so that it would be advantageous all round. The Minister of Railways is now going to see that justice, long deferred, is done to Guysborough, and I congratulate him.

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Chairman, the programme which the minister has brought down for the construction of branch railways interests me considerably. For many years certain sections of Nova Scotia, in addition to that portion which is so worthily represented by my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. McIsaac), have been in need of further railway advantages. In 1901 a company undertook the construction of a railway to the southern shore of the island of Cape Breton from the strait of Canso to the historic town of Louisburg. Thirty miles was constructed from Point Tupper to St. Peter's, and was operated as a branch railway until 1919, when I think the late government purchased it from the owners and it has since been operated in conjunction with the Canadian National Railways. I desire to point out to the minister what it was my privilege to bring to his attention years ago when he held his present portfolio, and that is the necessity for constructing the line from St. Peter's to Louisburg. As is well known, Louisburg is the only open winter port on the southern shore of Cape Breton through which Newfoundland traffic passes. Unfortunately during the winter months the harbour of Sydney is usually blocked with ice floes so that passenger and freight traffic from Newfoundland has to be diverted to Louisburg. But on disembarking at Louisburg passengers have no railway accommodation except a coal train running to Sydney, where it connects with the Canadian National Railways. Of course, it is well known that the historic town of Louisburg was a very important military post during the French regime. It is now an important fishing centre.

We are suffering very much in eastern Canada, particularly in Nova Scotia, under prevailing conditions. When I heard my good friends from the West speaking of the hard times in their constituencies, I was inclined to make comparisons between western and eastern conditions. Without wishing to minimize in the slightest degree the conditions described by them, I beg to assure my hon, friends from the West that conditions in Nova Scotia today call for as favourable treatment as is required in any other part of the Dominion. I shall not go into the reasons in detail and so delay the progress of this bill. I have listened with very much interest to the minister's answer to the question put to him by several hon. members opposite as to whether or not this programme constituted all the railway construction during the next three years. Neither last session nor this have I pressed for the construction of this railway, because I had reason to believe that the financial conditions were not such as to justify any new construction. But the magnificent and varied programme of railway construction in western Canada satisfies me that the government has overcome its greatest difficulties with regard to finances and finds itself in a position to undertake further railway construction. Therefore I would remind the minister that my constituency is very much in need of this branch line. I serve notice upon him now that at an early date in the next session I shall renew this request in the expectation that provision will be made for the construction of this railway in the Supplementary, if not in the Main Estimates next year.

Mr. KNOX: In regard to Nos. 11 and 12, both short branch lines, I should like to have the minister's assurance that these will be completed this year. The Paddockwood line is practically all graded, the other line, the Melford branch, is partially graded, and the people to be served by these branches are very anxious to have some assurance that steel will be laid this year. The Paddockwood line runs through a district which was largely settled by soldiers, and was mentioned in the report brought down by the Pensions board last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be foolish for the minister to give assurances of what can be done this year. However, there will be some work done on these lines. I hope they will be completed, but I cannot bind the board or the construction company. The best that can be done will be done.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is really meant? On the one hand we are told that the work and financing will be spread over a three-year period; then on the other hand we hear that it is not anything of the kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend's memory is short; I did not say that it was not anything of the kind.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, other members say so and you say nothing.

Mr. GRAHAM: Silence is golden sometimes. I did say a few moments ago that parliament is supreme, that while this is a three-year programme parliament can do anything.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the real intention?

Mr. GRAHAM: We hope to have this programme completed in three years. I can

readily see some reason for my hon. friend's statement, because in looking over this carefully I see nothing to confine the programme to three years. I propose to move an amendment to insert in the second line of section 2 certain words which I have handed to the Chairman, to make it clear that it is a three-year programme.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that that helps us very much. We are trying to find out what is the real intention of the government. Of course parliament can turn the government out—very likely it would if it were at all wise.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be a bad thing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the government now declare that this programme represents their railway construction for the next three years?

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say that at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am trying to find out what the fact is.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps my hon. friend will listen carefully this time. I said that parliament can do anything it likes—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have that already.

Mr. GRAHAM: —and that the government can introduce anything it likes. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, if it is thought wise to have the Canadian National Board select the most pressing cases out of several hundred and give us a three-year construction programme, that does not mean that there will be no other work undertaken during that three years. Nobody is bound by this three-year programme being absolutely definite.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I take it that it is a three-year programme which you may depart from as much as you like.

Mr. GRAHAM: As much as parliament likes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We will have to leave it at that. What are the business reasons for the Sunny Brae branch? We have had the political ones from various politicians interested as well as their advice. I ask for the engineering and traffic reports on this proposed line.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not suppose that in the case of any projected railway a report could be produced showing it is going to pay right away. Every enterprise of this character has to depend for its justification either upon an expectation of early success or upon the prospect of opening up and developing country. We do not always insist that a railway enterprise should pay immediately, even that there should be an assurance of early profitable operation. As the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. McIsaac) has pointed out, here is an old settled country. Let us be reasonable in this matter. When the people in old settled districts in the Maritime provinces who for generations have not had the advantage of railway communication find that large enterprises are being undertaken in the construction of new lines in the West, it is natural that they feel that some consideration should be had for the development of that eastern country. We find no fault with the West for its ambition; we are glad to encourage the building of roads there. But if you are going to do anything to check the unrest in the eastern parts of the country you must help the construction of roads in old settled districts where for ages there has been a lack of communication That must be done if the country is to develop. This line from Sunny Brae into Guysborough county will develop an excellent agricultural district and a fine lumber district, and will touch the valuable fisheries. I think it has ultimately as fair a prospect of success as most new lines, but whether it is going to pay or not, I say it is one of the enterprises which will help to develop the Maritime provinces and I ask the committee not to be too critical as to the prospect of its paying at once.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend means that this railway is going to be built not because it will serve a useful purpose, but because it is going to please a few people.

Mr. FIELDING: That is one reason.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is probably the chief reason; otherwise some better business reasons would be offered. The usual thing in connection with the building of railways is to have a report from an engineer on its possibilities, and I do not know why we should not have that information in this case. It rather looks to me as if the Minister of Finance was afraid of the information. What is wrong with it? It may be of course, that this board, being, apart from the president and the official connected with him, entirely a political board, do not think it necessary to have these ordinary reports. But surely it is reasonable to

ask that the minister should read to the House the engineer's report as to the traffic possibilities in this case.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did that a few moments ago; perhaps my hon. friend was not in. I read the reasons given by the board why they believed a railway line should be constructed through this territory.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I heard that. But I was asking for the report of the engineer which the board, unless, as I have said, it is purely a political board—

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is altogether too suspicious.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was asking for the report which would be a justification for their recommendation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose my hon. friend is making an exception of this line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps with some excuse. I am going to read all that the board states in the matter; it is what their engineers, of course, have said. This memorandum reads:

> The purpose of the line is to open up the local territory for lumber industry and provide better facilities for agricultural products as well as give direct communication to Guysborough for its fishing and allied products. On part of the route there is considerable agricultural development and quite extensive hardwood forests which the railway will make it possible to develop.
>
> The original intention of the surveys for this line had in view a low grade line with the idea of making it the main line. The results of the surveys indicated that to obtain this character of line it would be very costly, and on account of the fact that the present main line could not be abandoned, and would have to be maintained and operated, it could not be shown that such a line, with its excessive cost of construction, would be justified. The present intention is to construct a line to open up the local territory and build it to cheaper standards of construction but keep in view the eventual use of it for an alternative main line or at any time this would be warranted, Therefore the line will be located so that eventually a low grade could be obtained, but employ steeper grades for the immediate construction.
>
> It has been estimated that there are 250 million feet of hardwood and 200 million feet of softwood available to the line, and also some possibilities in gold and iron mining which have not been developed, possibly due to lack of transportation facilities.
>
> The justification for this line is that it will serve a section of the country that has been in long need of railway communication in order to give it a real chance for development and to put the town of Guysborough in direct rail communication with the Canadian National system.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, that does give us some information. It says we have in sight a traffic from 250 million feet of one kind of wood and 200 million feet of another kind. How much of that wood is being taken out now and carried by water?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no idea.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was stated by the member for York-Sunbury—

Mr. KYTE: Who does not know anything about it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told he was altogether mistaken.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the engineer say that lumber operations are now carried on in that district?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that the lumber operations are not being carried on now in the district through which this road is to run.

Mr. KYTE: Lumber operations are carried on now at the mouth of the St. Mary river below Sherbrooke. It is carried from there by water, but it does not touch the territory in question.

Mr. GARDINER: In regard to the Hanna-Medicine Hat branch in the province of Alberta, I may say that the grade south of the Red Deer river has been built for some time, but no steel has yet been laid. I see nothing in this schedule which indicates that any work is contemplated on that line. What is the board going to do with this particular piece of grade?

Mr. GRAHAM: I can only give the same answer that I have already given to another hon. member: Out of the great number of projects submitted to the board and investigated by them, a few were selected—many were called but few were chosen. A certain number were designated as active lines; these are being proceeded with under the present programme. Others are known as inactive lines; these are projected to the extent of 584 miles at different points in the West. I could not make any promises, but I suppose there will come a time when these will have to be transferred to the active lists. At present, however, no immediate action is to be taken with regard to them. The Hanna-Medicine Hat line is in this category.

Mr. GARDINER: The grade south of Red Deer has been built for over three years and it is deteriorating all the time. There is just the possibility that when they do come to place steel on it they will have to do some more grading in order to bring the road-bed up to the required standard. It will be un-

fortunate if steel is not laid this year, because the grade is going back all the time. Besides, a great deal of money would be saved if the work was proceeded with at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): The minister has sent across to me a map which shows the proposed location of the branch line to which I referred a short time ago. As I said before, I have no objection to the branch line running in the direction indicated by this map but I do want to object emphatically to the abandonment of the original route if the building of this new branch means that it will be abandoned. The Minister of Agriculture came to the defence of the new branch by stating he thought that the district was being served by a line built at right angles to the proposed line and some one hundred miles farther west. It is absolutely absurd to suggest that the building of a line at right angles to the proposed line and at such a great distance from the end of the steel could possibly serve the people in through that whole area.

There is another objection I have to make to the proposed line as shown in this schedule, and it is that it parallels and at no point appears from the survey to be seven miles away from the Canadian Pacific Railway line which is being constructed this year. It seems to me that it is not the policy that should be followed. The Canadian Pacific apparently intend to get that line through. They are building it at the present time and I can see no good service that will be done by paralleling it with the National line when there are territories which by travelling in a westerly instead of a northerly direction could be served by this line. It is advisable perhaps to swing north for a short distance to serve the Soldier Settlement areas that I mentioned when speaking before, but it should not in my estimation go north paralleling the Canadian Pacific till it strikes the Prince Albert branch. It should turn westerly after reaching the soldier settlement areas, and then traverse the section that was originally laid out for it, and which was settled as far back as fifteen or sixteen years ago and has had settlers in there farming in anticipation of this line through all these years.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the construction work on the Hanna-Warden line to commence this year, and is Hanna to continue to be a divisional point?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely hon. gentlemen do not expect me to say where the sectional or divisional points are going to be. That is for those in charge of the operation of the road. I might as well say who the trackmen are going to be. I cannot go into that. I have to bring before the committee certain branch lines that the Canadian National Railway Board have unanimously recommended for construction. Further than that I cannot go. The season is so far advanced that one cannot say what can be done this year. It will depend upon the conditions. Autumn will be coming soon and the men will be in the harvest fields. If we had had our appropriations through the House by early spring it would have been different, but we had not and I fear there will not be a great deal done this year.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 2—Power to construct and complete lines described in schedules.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have an amendment to move to this section.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved in amendment that in section 2, after the word "completion" in the second line, the following words be inserted "—

—prior to the 31st day of August 1926.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister be good enough to give me the rate per mile which is adopted for the railways having regard to road construction as apart from the special cost? Of course he does not know where he is going to put his stations? I suppose he knows whether he has bridging to do or not.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some of these lines have bridges. One of them has a bridge that will cost a million and a half. You cannot compare that to any other line, because no other line might have a bridge of that kind.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not the point but I am glad the minister has the information as to the bridges. Perhaps he will give it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have given one bridge.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is that?

Mr. GRAHAM: Dunblane branch to Mawer, Saskatchewan.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the bridge over the Saskatchewan?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. With reference to some of the lines, the surveys are not definitely made, and the lines not definitely located. You cannot give the actual cost in a case of that kind. The engineers made a general estimate. My hon. friend asked me for the stations—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I stated that you could not tell where the stations were going to be.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then take a short line with four stations as an example. You could give an estimate for four stations, but what is the good of asking for estimates and advertising what it is going to cost? Engineers never give out their own private data as to what things ought to cost. The engineers make an estimate, but they do not publish it. They might as well throw up their hands when they ask for tenders, if they are going to announce what they think the work ought to cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Taking the very first one, $150,000, is that an estimate of what it ought to cost?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes that is everything complete on the line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everything is covered in the $150,000 in connection with the first item.

Mr. GRAHAM: That includes everything.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Suppose we take them all, so as to save time; do these figures include the cost necessary in order to have these lines built and ready for operation?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, so far as it is humanly possible to estimate what the cost will be. This is to complete the line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that all the work is covered. Whose estimates of cost are these?

Mr. GRAHAM: They are prepared by the engineers in the locality, and passed on to the chief engineer at the head office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And checked by the chief engineer?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: I would like to ask the minister some questions in regard to what is generally known as the Oliver-St. Paul railway. That is the railway running from Edmonton to North Battleford. It is completed as far as St. Paul. It runs from the east as far as St. Walburg, leaving a gap of about eighty miles. This railway has been promised the people in that vicinity for some fourteen years. The country is well settled. It is a very good country, but it is particularly handicapped, because to the south runs the Saskatchewan river, across which there are no bridges in the particular part to which I am referring, and they have to use ferries. At the present time the railway has a double haul on all produce being taken to St. Paul, which would bring the extra distance to about 300 miles, taking the run to Edmonton and back again via Vermilion. It seems to me it would be in the best interests of the country if that gap were completed. I see in the schedule under item 25 it is only proposed to build the railway to a point twenty-one miles east of St. Paul. As this is a three-year programme, would the minister kindly give me the reason why the plans were not made to carry it further than mile 21? I will have more questions to ask later.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is for hon. members whose lines are not taken in the programme but not so much for those whose lines are partially taken in. The same answer is applicable to all the requests of members in whose constituency no extensions are being made. This is all the Canadian National Board thought it wise at present to include in the programme. Every one will realize that the financial condition of the country will not allow us to launch out into what might be useful enterprises. We have to go along very slowly, to show our good intentions, but hope the conditions will continue to improve until all our hopes are realized in the development of the country and the development of the railways as well.

Mr. SPENCER: I appreciate very much what is being done, but if there is no guarantee of some sort that work is going to be continued for probably several years to complete the line from St. Paul to St. Walburg, we will not be able to keep the settlers in that country. The settlers have been there for a good many years. They are hauling in some instances upwards of 100 miles and if they have not some sort of guarantee that the gap will be completed, I am very much afraid we will lose a great many of them. I would ask the minister if we can look for the completion of that line within the three-year limit?

Mr. DAVIES: I should like to corroborate what the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) has said regarding this line. I do not intend to add to what he said, in order to save the time of the committee. Is it the

intention of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways to change the location of the line, the construction of which is necessary to fill that gap? I understand a more northerly route has been surveyed?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a difficult problem in connection with that line, my hon. friends know, between a small extension at one end and this larger one at the other. These are supposed to meet. The engineering staff and the Canadian National Railway Board have given a good deal of consideration to the question of route. There seems to be—and I speak subject to correction—a greater population nearer the river, but I am told by the engineering staff that the difficulties of construction are almost insurmountable in some places owing to the great cost.

Mr. DAVIES: Would that appertain to the northern route or the southern route?

Mr. GRAHAM: The southern route is the expensive one. Another and full investigation is going to be made of the proposed route or routes before a final decision is reached During the winter a very strong deputation waited on me with all the information. They impressed me, but I do not know anything about the practical construction. The question, however, will be fully considered, and what is thought best in the interest of the whole country will be decided upon.

Mr. CARROLL: I wish to refer the Minister of Railways to certain evidence which was brought out during the present session before the committee on Mines and Minerals. This evidence showed the grave necessity, if we wish to develop our coal industry, of extending and building certain lines of railways. I understand my colleague from Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Kyte) this afternoon directed the attention of the minister to the necessity of extending the Point Tupper-St. Peters road into the town of Louisburg.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many miles?

Mr. CARROLL: Sixty miles. According to the evidence which was brought out before our committee, that proposition would develop a very large number of mines in the vicinity. Then there should be the extension, if the government takes over the road, of the Inverness and Richmond railway, which now runs from Port Hawkesbury to Point Tupper, to the town of Inverness. In the committee there was also a proposition for a railway in the Peace river district to connect with the Grand Trunk railway. This line would develop a trade between that country and the Pacific coast. I am not interested locally in that matter, but I think the minister might find it worth his time to read over the evidence given by western gentlemen before that committee in connection with that line. He might also find it worth his while to read the evidence of eastern gentlemen before that committee as to the necessity of extending and building those eastern lines. We in this country, I hope, are attempting to arouse the people, governments, coal operators, transportation agencies, to the necessity of having a national fuel supply for Canada. Those gentlemen have come to Ottawa and have developed those ideas which I am suggesting to the minister, and I do not think I could make the cases any stronger for those roads than did those witnesses who under oath gave evidence in connection with those matters. While this year I am not asking for the extension or building of these lines, the reason why I personally am not doing so, is because I understood the government was not going into new operations of this kind. If I had so understood, I would have been after the minister day and night in connection with the matter. I do not think I can make the case any stronger for those three roads than the gentlemen who gave evidence.

Mr. GRAHAM: What are the three roads?

Mr. CARROLL: The extension of the line from St. Peters to Louisburg; the extension of the Richmond-Inverness road to Inverness, a distance of 18 or 20 miles, which would develop and open up one of the great resources of coal in this country. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) probably would mention the road in the western country, concerning which road much evidence was given before our fuel committee. Those are the three roads. I would respectfully suggest to the minister that when he has some spare time, he might, perhaps, read over the evidence given in connection with those roads. This evidence given before the committee on Mines and Minerals will be laid on the Table to-morrow or the day after. If he does, I am sure next year, without any exhortation on the part of any one in this House, he will be glad to bring down legislation for the construction and the extension of the lines I have mentioned.

Mr. GOULD: I realize the limitations that are placed upon the government in regard to the matter of spending money to provide the many branch lines of railways which have been asked for, but I think my case has precedence over a goodly number. I have thought

that the last government attempted to do penance, in that the road had been promised a long time ago, and they had even had graded some 16 or 18 miles. The farmers living along that grade did most of the work in their anxiety to have the road built. I speak of No. 9, the road from Peebles to Lampman. In my humble opinion, the road was commenced at the wrong end, simply because, had it started from the town of Lampman, it would have connected with the branch line to Bienfait and the coal fields north of the town of Lampman about 9 miles. That is a very urgent question in our part of the country, in that we are deprived of an adequate supply of fuel. The road likewise would have terminated on our own lines of railway, and this would have given an opportunity to our farmers to get their grain out. At the present time, all the grain in that territory is drawn to the lines of the Canadian Pacific. The road starts at Peebles in the district of Qu'Appelle, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Millar), and it comes into the district of Assiniboia about 6 miles, coming down the west side of the Moose mountains. There is a very high, mountainous country to the east of the road. If the road had been continued another 7 or 8 miles, even while it would not have tapped the coal fields, it would have facilitated the getting of grain to this railway much better than at the present time.

A further thing I wish to say in connection with this matter, is that materials, ties and steel, had been brought along the graded road in quantities sufficient, I think, to grade 11 miles, and last year the larger part of that material was removed. I cite this as an argument why we should have more consideration, if further consideration is to be given. I know the people living south of the present line of road will feel quite keenly disappointed,, in that the survey had been through there for a number of years to the town of Lampman, and provision is not made in the bill to carry the road further than Mile 22. I think that under this programme it should really go another 7 or 8 miles, or a total of 30 miles, to Lampman. In that way it would give direct access from our own line of railways to the coal fields. I am not urging this on the minister, and I am thankful that provision is made for the 22 miles. But if opportunity offers in the very near future, to extend this line further, I trust due consideration will be given to the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has not said what he is going to do for us in Toronto, in connection with the tremendous deadlock that we have at the union station there. We had a long and eloquent speech which I enjoyed very much, but I should have appreciated it to a greater extent had I been able to understand completely why emphasis should be laid upon the construction of more railways in Quebec in preference to the carrying out of work in other parts of the country. As I understood the hon. gentleman, he wanted more work done in Quebec, and he pointed out in very beautiful language the advantages of the country through which the railways would run. He showed how much more important it was to have done what he was advocating than it was to do the little work in Toronto to which I referred this afternoon. He declared that little was done for the province of Quebec. I do not ask that anything be done especially for one part of the country as against another; I do not think that we have any right to consider at all whether any work is to be carried out in Ontario, in Quebec, in Manitoba, or anywhere else. The whole question should be whether it is right that such work be gone on with. The statement was made that it was very much more important to look after this new line of railway in Quebec than to right what is a flagrant wrong which has been going on for some time and is getting worse all the time. If we are to discuss this question of the relative importance of various works in different parts of the country, I would point out to the committee that the system that is making money down in this section of the Dominion, the Grand Trunk system, earned in Ontario $26,000,000 largely through that very terminal business in Toronto, as against the sum of slightly over $5,000,000 in the province of Quebec. It is utterly idle for people to try to make these comparisons: As I say, the whole question in regard to expenditures that are to be made anywhere should be as to whether or not those expenditures are justifiable. Surely my hon. friend should indicate to the committee where we shall land if we neglect the matter to which I referred this afternoon and of which I am speaking now. Surely he does not want the municipality to spend more money. It is out $26,000,000 now, and I cannot believe that the hon. gentleman would want to subject it to further inconvenience and harass it any longer. The people of Toronto have been menaced too long now. Thousands, yes sometimes eighty thousand, ninety thousand, and even a hundred thousand people using the crossings have been held up in one day, often in imminent peril. Does the hon. gentleman want that condition of affairs to continue and to be aggravated? I am sure

that the board must have some policy by this time in connection with this matter, and the serious complaint of central Toronto demands by way of answer more than mere silence on the part of the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend was not here this afternoon. The reason I have said nothing on this question is due to the fact that an arrangement exists between the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) and myself that Wednesday next be set apart for the discussion of the matter. I realize, however, that my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) is as much entitled as any other hon. member to raise the question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not know about the arrangement to which the minister refers; I was not here when it was made.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose, though, that this would be an opportune time to discuss the whole situation, even though the hon. member for North Toronto is not present. He can make his representations when he is ready in any event.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend is going to take the matter up on Wednesday I do not want to put him to the trouble of dealing with it twice. All we want is a fair opportunity to discuss the subject on Wednesday, if that day is understood to be set apart for the purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member for North Toronto wrote to me asking whether Wednesday would be convenient and I replied that it would.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In the meantime I have a question to ask the minister. He has given us the report of the engineers in regard to the construction of line No. 2. I am familiar with the prairie provinces, about whose necessities I have some knowledge. I am fairly acquainted too with the reports in connection with that part of the country. But I am not at all so conversant with the first proposed line in the list. Would the minister be good enough to give us the gist of the report of the engineers recommending the first line?

Mr. GRAHAM: The town of Lockeport is four miles from the station of Lockeport and has no direct communication. The spur line is intended to connect the town and the intermediate country with the station of Lockeport. The situation is somewhat similar to that in the case of the town of Cardinal in the county of Grenville where there is a two-mile spur.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How long has the present station been where it is?

Mr. GRAHAM: It has been in its present situation a good many years, I think.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is one of the original stations?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the report in regard to line No. 4—Grande Freniere, Quebec, to Rinfret Junction?

Mr. GRAHAM: An hon. member discussed that line this afternoon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not No. 4.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. He referred to the Laurentian mountains when discussing this particular line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think he discussed it only partially.

Mr. GRAHAM: The purpose of this line is to shorten the route into Montreal. The right of way has already been secured. It is intended to make direct communication between Montreal and the Laurentian mountains, and it would pay to make that connection direct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What about No. 5—Long Lac to Nakina, Ontario?

Mr. GRAHAM: The China Clay branch line is to provide direct communication with St. Remi d'Amherst.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the population of that place?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know.

Mr. BOYS: The minister says that the question in regard to Toronto will be discussed on Wednesday at the request of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church). Will that discussion come up under some item, or is it the intention of the minister to leave the bill in committee stage for the purpose? I want to support to some extent what has been said by my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) in connection with the union station. If the subject is to be taken up on Wednesday I do not want to delay the committee by discussing it now, but I should like to get some information. If the discussion is to be allowed on the third reading I do not think it would be very satisfactory.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was not intended that the discussion should take place particularly in connection with the bill. The hon. member for North Toronto simply wished to present Toronto's case to the House.

Mr. BOYS: But how would he do it?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Prime Minister gave him the assurance that he would be able to raise the question on going into supply or on the Orders of the Day. The hon. member wrote me a letter to that effect to which I agreed.

Mr. BOYS: Has the question of the completion of the Union station been considered by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM: Parliament will have to provide in some way eventually for the Canadian National Railways' share of the cost, but the government has not yet considered the question. I agree with everything that my hon. friend can say as to the Toronto union station and I am in hopes that some arrangement can be made between the companies and the Toronto Terminal Company, which is really composed of those concerns, to find some way out of the difficulty.

Mr. GOULD: What is the explanation of the extraordinary difference in the cost per mile of these lines? I find that in Alberta the estimated cost per mile is $26,502; in Saskatchewan, $25,944; in Manitoba, $19,174; in Quebec, $30,142; in New Brunswick, $50,400; in Nova Scotia, $51,563.

Mr. GRAHAM: The cost per mile varies according to the nature of the country through which the line is built. My hon. friend gave the reason when he pointed out that the mileage in his own vicinity has been graded, in which case of course the cost is that much less than where the grading has not yet been done. For instance, we have already spent $5,000,000 on the Okanagan valley line.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Do these proposed branch lines have to be approved by the Railway Commission?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think perhaps I can help my hon. friend. Under the general law the route map is approved by the Minister of Railways, and afterwards the Railway Board approve the line within deviation limits of one mile.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Railway Commission could not change the route more than a mile from that laid down on the route map?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Railway Commission decide on the best route within deviation limits of one mile of the route laid down on the route map.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not quite certain whether the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919 changed that.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—lines to part of Canadian Government Railways and constructed by company.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the idea of this section? I thought our National Railways were all under one system? Are they still being kept separate?

Mr. GRAHAM: Parliament does in a measure build lines that are really government-owned lines—something like the practice under the old Branch Lines Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see, the real distinction is this: The government owns the property of the government lines, but it does not own the property of the National lines; the company owns the property and the government owns the stock.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The distinction, I presume, is necessary. But why is it necessary when new branch lines are being built? Might they not just as well be built by the National Railways and made a part of the National system even though they do connect, say, with the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is thought that that would not be the better way to do it. We take the whole government-owned system through the Maritime provinces, say, and treat the branch lines as part of that system. I think it would be a little difficult to work out in detail if the Canadian National Railways started to build a little line here and another there. It seems to me that it will be better, for the present at any rate, to keep all the government-owned lines together.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that there is any real distinction, unless the idea is that it is just as well to keep the government-owned railways separate from the National lines. I would have thought it would be easier if the tail went with the hide—if everything went into the pot. The government controls the whole thing either as owner or shareholder; and, further, the government is building both sets of branch lines. I think it would be easier for the officers if they had the one set of capital books. Is this distinction going to be carried out in connection with everything, so that we are to have two sets of accounts, and so forth?

Mr. GRAHAM: It will have to continue until parliament decides to issue securities against the government-owned railways. Personally, I do not think that would be a good idea to-day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does it not really turn on whether you think it is a good idea to work these absolutely into one property or not? If we are to have two sets of accounts —and apparently we are—it is costing just so much more money. Is it not a good deal better for the government to show what the property is charged so the net debt will not look any worse than it really is? I cannot see anything in the objection. Of course if the idea is that the whole system is to be kept so that it can be unscrambled at any time, and in the meantime we are to have merely temporary joint management instead of one hundred per cent co-ordination with one hundred per cent economy, it is all right.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not think that. There is a strong feeling against bringing the old government-owned lines under a mortgage which they have never yet carried. I think separate accounts will have to be kept. The capital account of the government railways is simple, but I admit there is difficulty in keeping the accounts separate as between the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, a difficulty which we are trying to eliminate. It costs a lot of money, it is true, but in this respect I think it is not expensive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Apparently there is nothing but a sentimental objection to having the mortgage that we really owe cover our own lines. All the government need do is simply to convey the government-owned lines to the Canadian National Railway system. This would be merely a conveyance of the fee simple. Once this is done, instead of continuing about five different systems of book-keeping one should be sufficient. I do not doubt at all that it would save the country—well, close to a million dollars a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I still think that for the present at least the better way is to leave it as it is. It does not cost a considerable amount to keep the separate accounts. For example, the accounts of the Grand Trunk and the Grank Trunk Pacific have to be kept separate because the interest on the Grand Trunk Pacific guaranteed debenture stock is payable contingent upon the earnings of the old Grand Trunk, and you have to keep the accounts of the Grand Trunk separate for that purpose. We are trying to unscramble it, as my hon. friend says, but it is not so easy.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true; you have to keep the accounts separate in order to be able to determine whether the Grand Trunk has sufficient earnings to meet the interest on all these Grand Trunk Pacific debentures, and the same applies to the Canadian Northern income convertible bonds. Well, I suggest that at the earliest possible day the government make some sort of settlement with both. I think it would pay if the settlement were arrived at in a proper way and on a very modest basis to get rid of all this necessity for separate systems and separate book-keeping. But I hope the government will have the matter fully discussed here before they do that; I do not like to trust them to make any outside deal. Perhaps, while I am on my feet, I might ask how that syndicate is getting along in New York. Have the names got to the surface yet? Are they still on Fifth avenue?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not seen the names yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister yet able to produce that lawyer's letter guaranteeing the legality of the transaction? I would like, I think, to suggest that a reward be offered for the production of that letter.

Mr. GRAHAM: How high?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Pretty high. I have struggled with this government to get the verbal opinions verbally boasted of, but I have not unearthed one yet; I have not found a crowbar strong enough to dig one up. As the subject is sure to come up again, I here and now challenge the minister to get any lawyer in the employ of the Canadian National Railway Company, to recite what this company has done in connection with that hotel and say it is legal.

Mr. BOYS: Is it intended that the lines of railway mentioned in the schedule shall form part of the Canadian Government Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, no.

Mr. BOYS: I thought not, because section 3 says:

> Any of the said lines of railway connecting with the Canadian Government Railways may be declared by the Governor in Council to form part of the Canadian Government Railways.

What is to determine whether or not they shall? I see lower down that the title to the necessary lands or interests in lands is to be acquired in the name of His Majesty.

Mr. GRAHAM: Canadian National Railways are not of necessity government railways; they are owned by a company. Take No. 1 branch line, for instance, which is four miles long, and which will be constructed in connection with the Halifax and Southwestern; that may or may not be called a government railway. My idea is that every branch line that connects with and becomes a part of the Canadian Government Railways, strictly speaking, might well be called a branch of the government railways.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Advances for government railway lines.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What machinery does the government propose to adopt in order to give effect to this section?

Mr. FIELDING: It simply provides that in the event of the issue of securities the government may advance the money out of the public treasury.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think my hon. friend quite grasps the effect of the whole of this clause. The minister may advance the money, but the money must come from somewhere. It may come from the consolidated revenue fund, but moneys advanced from that fund are usually applied to a certain specific object, and it is usually thought best that they should be applied only to that object—that they should not be switched from one object to another. I admit we have departed from that rule in connection with the Hotel Scribe. Is it to be the same thing here, or does my hon. friend intend to put an amount in the estimates each year to provide for sums of money which are to be made subject to the call of the railways and are to be replaced afterwards by moneys raised by loan?

Mr. FIELDING: The authority to issue the bonds will be sufficient authority, I think, for the purpose. I have not looked very closely into the point my hon. friend raises. He suggests there would have to be a special appropriation out of which these moneys could be paid; I am rather assuming that will not be necessary, because we shall have the general borrowing powers which the government have for various purposes. However, the point is one which the legal authorities, perhaps, have not looked into as fully as they should. I shall be very glad to have the matter inquired into further.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The difficulty would not arise if my hon. friend had surpluses unappropriated by parliament. But the position is that the whole of his moneys are appropriated by parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: It is only a permissive authority, anyway; I am not anticipating we shall desire to use it very often. But I will give attention to my hon. friend's suggestion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice that the minister is bringing down a bill in connection with audit, which may cover this point as well as others.

Mr. FIELDING: It will cover authority to inquire into these matters.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Still, it would provide a check.

Mr. FIELDING: The resolution is now on the order paper.

Mr. BOYS: The total estimated cost of the construction of the lines mentioned in the schedule is not given, but apparently it will be about $30,000,000. Is it the intention that any portion of that amount should come out of vote No. 139, the amount of which is $73,000,000?

Mr. FIELDING: That vote is for the ordinary working expenses of the road.

Mr. BOYS: Item 139 of the estimates, page 32, says:

> The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council. . . . by way of loans in cash, or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other.

One would imagine that the amount necessary for these branch lines could come out of this vote, having regard to the language used. What I want to know is whether it is the intention that that will be done, or is this $30,000,000 odd to be in addition to the $73,000,000?

Mr. FIELDING: The latter amount certainly does not cover these capital expenditures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly what I take objection to. The minister says that the $73,000,000 that we have already voted, and which either may be expended in cash or may take the form of a government guarantee, does not include any of this money; that all this is extra, the $73,000,000 being simply the ordinary expenditure of the road. I submit to the minister that in other years the money voted in the estimates covered everything—covered lines that were ex-

tended, lines where the rails were laid—all these extensions in western and eastern Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: New construction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly, new construction, in western and eastern Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely for new construction the new lines would have to be specified?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the money was applied to was embraced in a statement that was laid on the Table.

Mr. FIELDING: It would not only have to be laid on the Table; it would have to be in the statute itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would not have to be in the statute at all. As long as the House was informed as to what the money was for, that was all that was necessary.

Mr. FIELDING: That is not enough.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course it is enough; the minister will find it is plenty if he will think the matter over. Take the case of the Merchant Marine. We did not specify the boats in the statute; we passed a vote to enable them to be built and then laid before parliament all the facts connected with their construction. This is money voted for the railways for such purposes as parliament has intimation of in a statement submitted to parliament. Where was the bill before about extensions? I have no recollection of it. Can the minister tell me? These were covered in the regular vote. Now then what the government is seeking to do, and I warn the House in time, is to be able to show a difference through this vote between the total estimate for the year and the previous year, and at the same time be spending the money under cover of another bill without its appearing in the Estimates. That is the effect of it all. In the past the votes have appeared. The country has known when the budget for the year was presented to the nation what it was going to be committed to for the ensuing year. But if this policy is followed it is not going to know. It is true that in a case like the agricultural education grant where a certain definite amount and no more was granted each year for a certain period, ten years I think, towards agricultural education, that was a statutory vote and so much per year was paid out, but there was no previous system of doing it otherwise in that case as there has been for this. Furthermore the country knew each year from the statutes what its commitment was, but here we do not know what our commitment is for any year. This government is simply asking for a blank cheque to be spent at any hour of any day within the next three years and avoiding putting an amount in the Estimates any year. Now that is something new. In fact, there is scarcely ever a statute this government submits to parliament that has not concealed in it an attempt to draw more power all the time into the administration—more of this order in council authority. This is definitely and irrefutably an attempt of that kind.

Now what I ask the government to do is this: If you want to go ahead with a special act, all right, but put in that special act the usual clause that the money for the purpose shall be voted by the Commons of this country. Then we shall know just exactly what we are doing and what the money is going to be applied to. I raised this point on the main motion and I intend to press it now. The government should not ask for a blank cheque covering three years when the country does not know how much is going to be spent in any year at all. It should not ask for power to spend this money at any time and at whatever time it suits the government best, whatever time it suits the exigencies best. Let the government add a clause here that the Appropriation Act that covered it in the past shall cover it in the future.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. He is assuming that in the past all expenditures have been set forth in the Estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not state that.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend has repeatedly said so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said there was an exception in the case where there was a definite amount per year, but not in the case of railway appropriations.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about railway subsidies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not looked up subsidies, but if subsidies have been, go ahead and do it the same way but do not take something that was in the Estimates before and jerk it out of the Estimates and put it under cover of a separate bill in order to mislead the country as to the actual commitments year by year. The country should know what it is going to spend.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. There is no blank cheque in this particular transaction. There is a list

of proposed railways and the amount appropriated for each is set forth. How does my hon. friend get the notion of a blank cheque? Here is a distinct appropriation of every amount set forth and it is to be voted by parliament. That is what we are doing now. So why does my hon. friend talk of a blank cheque? I emphasize the fact that railway subsidies running into the millions were always voted in a separate and distinct bill. I cannot recall a case when it was not so under both governments. Surely my hon. friend knows that his whole argument is wrong. Subsidies have always been voted distinct and separate from the Estimates. We are making no departure here. We are just following the usual practice. We are not voting railway subsidies here but railway appropriations under precisely the same method.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In previous years these have been in the Estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, but they have. Does any hon. member of the ministry say to me: We have not in the past since the National Railway Act came in made extensions in western Canada? And where is the special act calling for it? We advanced the money under the authority of the Appropriation Act to the National Railway Board. Now then the government is changing what has always been the practice in that regard in order to mislead the country. There may have been some excuse in the case of railway subsidies. There certainly was in the case of the agricultural education grant. I have not looked up subsidies and I am not going to say yes or no whether it was done in that case or not. But in any case the government had nothing to say about it once it passed the act. If the railway went on they got the subsidy, and if it did not, they did not.

9 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING: The government had nothing to say about it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. They had of course to pass the order in council, but the railway was entitled to the subsidy if it went ahead, and it could wait ten or fifteen years. There was reason in that case. But here the government knows, or should know, because we own the stock, what they are going on with and what they are are not going on with, and there is no reason why they should not show in the Estimates just what they are going to spend. Why is this done? What is going to be spent? What is the reason for taking it out of the Estimates? The reason is clear to my mind. The government wants to be able to draw an unfair and unjust comparison of its Estimates this year and in future years with those of previous years.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend will be here to see that that is not permitted, and I know he will do it well; he always does.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right, but when the minister gets before the country he will hold up the Estimates, and I cannot follow him through the country or even through the papers.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will take him with me next time, and as for my paper it has been mighty decent to him at a time when he needed it. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has explained fully to the committee why this is necessary. He spoke of subsidies. Now the reason why that method might have been necessary was because the government did not know how many miles would be constructed in any year, and that is the answer here to a large extent. The Canadian National Railway Board is going to construct these lines. This season they cannot construct much, but next year on account of this act, through not having to wait for construction to begin until after the estimates are through, construction can begin early in the season and be continued right along. The board know what they can do and how much they can construct, but if they have to wait year after year until the Estimates are through before they can start construction, experience shows that that is impracticable. The construction of these railways ought to be rushed wherever they are being constructed at times when labour can be secured between busy seasons. If we have to wait every year until the estimates are through construction will be held off for three months. The financial year ends March 31 and there would be no more money to go on with construction until the last estimates were through the House. Hon. gentlemen know that the men who would wish to get on this construction work during the summer would probably be needed on the farms later on in the year for harvesting. It is very difficult to get labour at such times.

There is no endeavour to hide anything here. It is simply to place a three years' programme and vote the money so that we shall not have to wait every year until the estimates are through before we can start construction. If this work were all going to be completed this year, it would be a different

matter. We could say we are going to need this much, and clean it up, but we do not pretend that all this construction will be completed this year. The programme is for three years, and there is no attempt whatever at deception. Under the old estimates there were certain small extensions and so on, and my hon. friend will appreciate the difficulties under that method. He graded 372 miles, yes, 500 miles, in the West and then stopped. Now under a three years' programme at least some of these lines would have been completed in the three years, but as it was they were not. Many of these lines have rails on them; they are graded now, but the grade in some places is partially destroyed, I suppose. To my mind it is merely a matter of horse sense to proceed by this method. Let the company know for three years what they can depend on. Here are the amounts and it is no trouble to keep track of them. Parliament will have full opportunity to discuss them. I think this is the absolute business way to carry on this project.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has cleared up the situation rather well. He has put it so we can understand it, at any rate. It is a change, just as my hon. leader said. It is a complete change from what was done before. It makes a complete change in the basis of the estimate. He points out that of course this was not done before. We had it from the Minister of Finance that it was done before—no change at all. Of course there is a change and of course all this capital construction was controlled and voted by the House. There is no doubt about it and the minister makes it clear. Now, he says there is an objection to that and that is that you cannot spend all your money in the one year. If it is a good objection that you cannot spend all your money in the one year, there is no reason why parliament should ever look after the estimates at all. There is hardly an estimate of any size in which there is not that item of revote. Every department has its revote. Is that any reason why some irresponsible commission should have the right of looking after the whole thing without coming back to parliament? Is that any reason why the departmental estimates should not still be submitted? But there is the whole thing: You do not know how much you are going to spend, and, therefore, you should not do it by way of estimates! You do not know how much you are going to add this year or next. The whole truth is that there is just one thing that is of any importance here, and I have not been able to get it. If we can have definite estimates of such a character laid on the Table that we know that the whole work is going to be done under the one vote, without coming back again, it will be a good thing. I could not get anything definite today—not a thing. There is absolutely no guarantee to the House in connection with it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Was there ever in connection with any public work?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am saying that is the only thing that is of any use, if you can get it in connection with the three-year lease, so that you will not have the officials coming back time after time with the larger votes. We have not anything more definite here than we have in connection with the building of a $500 post office. We have practically no details at all in connection with the $28,000,000 programme. My hon. friend says we have rights of way and dumps and all that sort of thing and that we did not go on with them. That did not make a bit of difference as to any three years' business—not the slightest. It was the inescapable condition that we and the country were in. That was all and nothing else. The mere fact of a bill would not have produced any money, and the mere fact of this bill will not produce any money. The country might just as well understand that this is a complete change from the former method of accounting under which, in connection with the railway estimates each year, the country knew just exactly what their railways were costing for everything. But the whole commitment, whether on capital account, construction account, guarantee or deficit, was all there. Now the country wants to know about it. There is nothing in the bill to say the return is to be made from the commencement, showing how many miles have been constructed, and where, and showing how much money has been expended. Has the minister taken any precaution in connection with these votes to prevent switching of public funds from one purpose to another? What guarantee have we, for example, that when we vote $3,000,000 for the purpose of a railway that the money is going to be spent there and not somewhere else—that the money, perhaps, is not going to be spent in Germany next time, instead of in France, as the other vote was spent?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the auditors should be depended on to look after that. They are more competent to deal with that phase than I am. As to everything being in the Estimates, I can point out to my hon. friend that refunding of the Canadian Northern was provided for under the statute and not under the Estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of what?

Mr. GRAHAM: Of Canadian Northern securities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A refunding does not involve any further liability. That is simply changing the loan from one person to another person.

Mr. GRAHAM: Sometimes it had to go in the estimates of other railways and refunding might be very important.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is important, but it does not add or subtract from the country's liabilities.

Mr. GRAHAM: If a certain amount were in one estimate under a bill refunding, and allowed for that amount, it would change your method of book-keeping altogether, and the Estimates would not be comparable for the two years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid that is going a long way. It is a poor excuse.

Mr. MARTELL: I would like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that the Canadian National Railways have taken in the Canadian Northern, along with the Halifax and Southwestern road, and I would like to ask whether or not the present government has considered the advisability of constructing a railway from Windsor in Hants county to a point at or near Chester in the county of Lunenburg? This has been a political question for years and has been made a polical football by every party in this country. A railway from Windsor in Hants county to a point at or near Chester in the county of Lunenburg would pass through Martock, Windsor Forks, Leminster or Chester Road, a magnificent lumbering country, and would supply a great deal of wood for shipment over the Halifax and Southwestern which is now owned by the government. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the merits of the question, but I would like an assurance from the minister that he will have Sir Henry Thornton look into the advisability of proceeding with this branch, because it would be a very valuable line for the people in that section of the country. It is particularly necessary to have the question looked into, now that the government owns the Halifax and Southwestern, and I would like to have a promise from the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall note the remarks my hon. friend has made and place them before Sir Henry Thornton.

Mr. MARTELL: I have more confidence in the minister than in Sir Henry Thornton.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know whether there can be said to be any political advantage in providing for a bill of this description. If, as we understand, the Canadian National Railways are outside of politics, then I understand that the schedule has been presented by the National Railway to parliament to vote this amount of money, and if parliament votes this amount of money for three years, it seems to me that no party will be able to go out in the ridings and claim any political advantage. If I understood the minister aright as to how this sum is voted, there is only one way in which it can be spent, and that is on the particular lines which have been indicated in the bill.

I wish to say a few words in regard to item No. 19—Dunblane branch. I had an opportunity of speaking to the minister and those in charge before recess, and I have the arguments in regard to the matter. Yet, at the same time I have received a great many telegrams from county councillors and also farmers in the vicinity, against the expenditure of this money in the particular way in which it is proposed to spend it. There is one thing to be considered as regards this branch line that proceeds from Moose Jaw to Riverhurst. It was generally understood by the people in that vicinity that at some time or another the line to Riverhurst would be extended beyond the river to link up with some of the other National lines. With that result in view, Riverhurst has become an important town. In 1921, a large sum of money was spent near Riverhurst in providing for a dam for a splendid water supply for the town and for the railway to Moose Jaw. Furthermore, Riverhurst is a divisional point. If this proposed railway is constructed, Riverhurst will become simply a dead end so far as we are able to understand the matter. I do not think there is any agitation at present from the people in the vicinity for the line to take the route which it is proposed it should take. As regards the railway situation, I know the whole country like a book, and the two railways, the Canadian Pacific to Elbow and the Grand Trunk to Riverhurst practically run parallel. There is no place where they are 20 miles apart. On the Canadian Pacific side for the last 15 to 20 miles, the country is simply sand hills, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) a short time ago brought down a bill whereby the people in that district had the right to relinquish their lands, to give them back to

the government and to receive lands in territory where they might be able to farm. After this railway proceeds a few miles north of Lawson and then in a northwesterly direction to Elbow, I do not think for 15 miles it will pass a single inhabited house. A person taking an automobile ride from, say, Lawson, north to Elbow, where this railway is about to run, after proceeding 6 miles north, would for the next 10 miles, hardly see a dwelling house for the simple reason that the northwesterly winds sweeping over the sand hills have covered even the good lands with sand, with the result that the people have gone to more fertile fields to farm. I understand from the engineers' report that this line is taking this particular direction, on account of the easier grade. It will be an easier grade for the railway, and it will be able to link up with the system across the river. The line, however, will not be any shorter. It will certainly mean, at last, building a line 30 miles longer than they would have to build if they continued the present line. The people south of the railway line have always expected that this line some day would be completed and would cross the river at Lucky lake and be linked up with that system. I can readily understand, if the railway which is contemplated in the bill ever is constructed, the government will never see fit to build another railway bridge, at least 20 miles south, with the result that the people on the fertile land south of the Grand Trunk will have to depend simply on a tri-weekly service, where on the other hand, if it is linked up to Dunblane with a line across the Saskatchewan river, they will have the advantage of the good service; but there will be no service for the railway to perform so far as that particular stretch of line is concerned.

I understand from the report that no part of this line will be built this year; that it will be proceeded with next year. I do not wish to stop this expenditure, nor to make any protest as to this item going through; but if the money must be spent in the particular way in which the minister states, it would be wise to hold the matter over until an investigation is made. Surely the engineers who built the railway in the first place from Moose Jaw to Riverhurst never intended that Riverhurst should become a dead end. They had something in view, or they would never have built 80 miles of line, made a divisional point at the far end, and then built a splendid dam costing thousands of dollars, with the intention of that town becoming a dead end. They intended to cross the river somewhere in the vicinity of Riverhurst, and to link it up with the line across the river. This proposed line will run through a territory that is not even calling for the line west and north to Elbow, and it crosses the same Saskatchewan river. It is true on the east side of the Saskatchewan river there is no great bank difficulty to overcome; but when you come to the other side, in order to reach Dunblane, you have to have a bridge that will be high enough to surmount the hill which is hundreds of feet high, and at the same time the line must pass through a very sandy territory to get there. It seems to me the pledge to the people living in the good territory who are producing wheat and making the railway pay, should be carried out, and they should have an opportunity of seeing the line extended across the river into the same kind of territory where the same service will be rendered to the same people, and where the line at the same time will cost a good deal less. I understand there is a report on the situation, and before I can speak definitely and intelligently on it, I should like to hear the minister's report as regards this particular line. I hope he will again look into the matter, and although I do not think we have any right to interfere with the policy of the National Railways, yet due consideration should be given to the people who are living in that territory and to the pledges that were made to them some years ago when they went into that territory and also formed a town.

Mr. GRAHAM: According to my hon. friend the farm furthest from the stub end would be only 12 miles?

Mr. LEWIS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be the furthest farmer away at that end. I do not blame my hon. friend for putting in a strong plea for those people. They are pretty well served now. But in order to make a through connection between the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, to get a through line with good grades from Regina to Moose Jaw, the engineers say that it is necessary to build this other line in the manner proposed. It is through traffic they are after with the best grades possible. The best grade it is possible to get on the line proposed by my hon. friend is a full one per cent. In the other case, they can easily get a grade of one-half of one per cent. This makes a great difference in the load that can be hauled on through traffic and on the cost of transportation. If it be true, as it is, that the lower the grade, the cheaper the transportation,

surely it is in the interest of the farmers themselves, who are not too far away from the railway as none of them are, that they should have the best standard of railway that can be constructed for the through traffic. In addition to that, the cost of those 42 miles to the bridge, I am told, will be little if any more than the cost of the 12 miles with the bridge at the point where that road would cross the river.

Mr. LEWIS: As regards the question where the bridge is going to be placed, I should like to make a suggestion. So far as I know at present, there is no possible way of getting across the Saskatchewan river. This government owns the resources of the province of Saskatchewan. I understand the rivers are also under federal jurisdiction, so at present the only way in which the people have a chance of getting across the Saskatchewan river, which is a very deadly river, is by a ferry. I hope when such a bridge is contemplated, not only will they contemplate a bridge for trains, but they will consider an additional expense whereby a traffic bridge can be built. At the present time one would have to go right to Saskatoon, one hundred miles north, before one could find a bridge for traffic to cross the river.

I do not wish to say anything derogatory about the engineers, but let us consider just for a moment the methods of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That line starts from Moose Jaw and goes up to Elbow, in identically the same locality the government intends to run its railway. At Elbow on the Saskatchewan river the Canadian Pacific Railway decided that the crossing was not a good one and so it goes immediately north about thirty miles before it crosses the Saskatchewan river. Now if the Canadian Pacific Railway thinks that Elbow is not a convenient place at which to cross and its engineers find it necessary to go straight north thirty miles to Outlook before crossing the Saskatchewan river, it does seem rather strange that another set of engineers should come along a little time afterwards and decide that the crossing which the Canadian Pacific engineers considered undesirable is good enough for the Canadian National Railways. I say it does strike me at least as somewhat peculiar. But wherever the bridge is built I trust that traffic accommodation will be provided and that the people will have the fullest opportunity of crossing the river.

Mr. GRAHAM: That will be a question between the railway company and the provincial authorities.

Mr. LEWIS: I hope it will be taken into serious consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I wish to call the minister's attention to a very serious situation that exists in the city of Toronto, a city of some account.

Mr. GRAHAM: Evidently my hon. friend does not know that the Prime Minister by arrangement with the hon. member for North Toronto has agreed that this matter shall be brought up on Wednesday.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I may have something about the matter then, but I want to refer to it now.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has nothing really to do with the matter before the chair.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I think it has, and I want to point out that the most serious railway situation in Canada to-day exists in the city of Toronto, which I repeat is a city of some account, with a large business. The question there simply must be solved. It turns on the existence of two of the worst grades in Canada, that is, the Grand Trunk grade at Scarboro and the Canadian Pacific Railway grade through North Toronto. There is joint ownership of both lines on the north of the city. Between these two grades, of the Canadian Pacific of one per cent, and the Grand Trunk of one per cent, not three miles from either line there is a grade of one-half of one per cent; and there is a huge station at this place that is of no use. Besides this, there is a demand on the people of Toronto for the construction of an elevated esplanade at a very great cost, running into millions. I see that in item 26 in this schedule provision is made for a joint construction between the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but there is no solution suggested in reference to the Toronto situation, except by way of co-operation or joint action between the two roads.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that the item under consideration has reference to branch lines. My hon. friend is dealing with a situation in Toronto which I think is irrelevant. I submit that he is out of order.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And I contend that I am not.

Mr. JACOBS: Then I will ask for the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Does the hon. member desire to speak to the point of order?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not out of order inasmuch as we are voting moneys for the construction of railways and the matter to which I am referring has direct relation to the subject of railways.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are dealing with branch lines.

Mr. JACOBS: Is my hon. friend discussing branch lines?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am referring to the improvement of an existing line. I do not intend to take up much time discussing the question to-night, but I certainly want to bring to the attention of the minister the urgency of the situation in Toronto.

Mr. JACOBS: I would ask for the ruling of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The committee is discussing section 4 with reference to a certain schedule at the end of the bill. I rule therefore that any discussion beyond that is out of order.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): There is a provision in the bill, in item 26 of the schedule, for a joint line with the Canadian Pacific railway between certain points, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I am in order in directing the attention of the committee to the situation to which I have referred. If the question is to come up again on a day set apart for the purpose I shall deal with it then, but I take the opportunity now of calling the attention of the minister to the serious state of affairs in Toronto at the present time in regard to which there is no proposal either in this bill or elsewhere looking to a solution. When the vote is under consideration I am going to ask the minister if he has any scheme in contemplation to deal with the question.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Chairman has ruled this discussion out of order, but I might inform my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) who brought up the same question earlier in the evening, when informed that the Prime Minister had arranged with another hon. member to deal with the subject on a subsequent occasion, readily agreed to postpone his remarks until then. The discussion, so far as my hon. friend's remarks are concerned, is really out of order, but I do not wish to press my objection to his proceeding; I simply want to ask him to do as his colleague has done.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I certainly will do that, but I do not think I am out of order. Hon. gentlemen from other parts of the country are bringing up questions and grievances touching their constituencies, and I submit that I am perfectly in order in presenting the case of Toronto to the committee. However, I shall allow any further remarks I have on the subject to stand over until Wednesday.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Thank you.

Mr. MILLAR: I was alarmed a few minutes ago when I heard the minister state that in connection with branch lines not much could be done this year. I do not know whether I understood him rightly or not, but that is what I gathered at any rate. And the more am I alarmed when I realize how near we are to the first of July and how short a part of the season is left. Is it the intention of the government to do very little on the branch lines this year? If so, and very little can be done because of the shortness of the season, why could this matter not have been brought down several weeks ago? We have been passing estimates now for nearly two months and I do not see why this matter could not have been attended to before now. I can assure the minister that there will be the most bitter disappointment in the country with regard to item No. 9 if the proposed line is not dealt with this year. This is a district that is well settled. It has been settled now for fifteen or twenty years and the people are obliged to haul their produce seventeen, eighteen and nineteen miles over roads that are not like the Ontario roads by any means. Can the minister imagine what it must mean to haul grain that distance over mud roads? Not only that, but most of the grain is now going to the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereas if this branch line were built it would go by the Canadian National. I am sure that the people of this district will be very grateful to the government for undertaking to build this line even in the next three years, but at the same time they will resent the injustice of postponing it even beyond this year. The road has been graded for some time and the ties are waiting to be laid down; and very little more expenditure would have been necessary to complete the work, so that the settlers could have taken their grain out this fall. I shall be sorry if anything is done to delay the work and prevent this line being built until next year.

Mr GRAHAM: My hon. friend can realize the difficulty in this matter. Every hon. gentleman feels that his particular case is the most urgent and there are about ten times as many interested parties outside who have to be heard. All this must be considered and sifted and resifted and it is not easy

to select from so many when there is such a diversity of representation. The company hopes to conclude the line to which my hon. friend refers this year.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would draw the minister's attention to item 26, which is a joint section with the Canadian Pacific Railway. There are millions of dollars to be voted for the expansion of our railway system in competition with the Canadian Pacific. We are entering on a period of rival construction between the two great systems. Probably a question of absorbing interest to the people to-day is whether there is to be a policy of rival construction between the two roads with the resultant waste of money and lack of efficiency of service which co-operation and co-ordination would avoid. It is time that we scrutinized all these votes to see whether they are for lines to compete with existing lines, in whcb case the money might better be devoted to provide railway facilities in those portions of the country which require them. I would ask the minister if a policy has been decided upon between the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway so that instead of blind competition in the building of roads where they are not needed there will be co-operation to serve the best interests of the people at large. We should not conclude this session without making a declaration in regard to this matter. It is not only up to the government but up to the administration of the National Railways and the Canadian Pacific to say whether they intend to embark on a policy of rival construction. We want efficient construction in this country, not mad rivalry. I should like to hear from the minister on this point.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is largely something to be worked out between the railways. I think the day for mad rivalry is over in the interests of economy. As an object lesson, there are a couple of items in this schedule where two railways are running over the same track for a certain distance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Again I ask, are we going to discontinue the practice of including in the estimates our railway commitments? Some members think it is not a serious matter, but I venture to say that those who have given expression to this thought will be coming to parliament in future sessions complaining of conduct that is possible just because of this legislation. We never had any trouble—and I think I should know—in going ahead with any work because of delay in voting the money in the House; the only trouble we had was in getting money to go on with. The government comes every year and asks for interim appropriations, and if there is money needed these appropriations take care of the need. As a matter of fact, as everyone knows, we usually end the year without the money being spent. I repeat, we have never had any difficulty at all because of the restrictions the estimates contain, namely, that the votes must be spent in that year. There is no earthly reason why we should vote money for three years instead of one. We may just as well give up the whole system of presenting estimates to parliament for each year if we pass this bill and are not to know how much is to be spent in any single year and what work is to be undertaken. In other words, parliament is to know nothing; the government can do just what it likes with this enterprise. We give the government carte blanche now, and the minister persuades hon. members that it is all right. Further, under a subsequent section of this bill the minister can drive a coach and four all through the divisions that are set out in the schedule. He can take the money voted for one road and apply it to another, because section 7 simply wipes out all limitations and puts the minister in supreme command. I therefore propose to let hon. members take responsibility for the vote now by moving.

That there be added to section 4 by way of amendment the following proviso:

Provided that money for this purpose shall first be voted by parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend would accomplish nothing by such an amendment. This money will be appropriated by parliament if the resolution passes. Therefore why say this is subject to an appropriation made by parliament? Parliament is at this moment appropriating it. I really cannot see any force in my hon. friend's contention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Parliament should only authorize the works to go on. All other works are subject to appropriation by parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: But we are appropriating the money now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know, but we should not.

Mr. FIELDING: But we are appropriating it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But attach this proviso and we will not be. We will simply authorize the work to go on, but parliament will know every year what money is being spent.

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot understand my hon. friend's objection. I think there are many cases in which it is absolutely desirable that a department shall not be tied up from year to year, but shall be able to carry on without delay. I think the resolution itself is effective, but the general proviso he prefixes would interfere with construction of public works and cause delay when urgency is necessary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister might be good enough to make that clear to the House. We vote money for every single thing every year.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh no, not for every single thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, I might mention railway subsidies.

Mr. FIELDING: Those cover many millions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but in a railway subsidy you have no means of knowing what year it applies to. Here we have a way of telling, for we are absolutely in charge of the whole situation just the same as we are of the completion of this building. I say again, adopt this three-year method and you will so blur the estimates that the country will not know what is going to be spent every year. In a word, it is equivalent to simply destroying the estimate system in toto. Consequently it seems to me that hon. gentlemen will later have to give good reasons why they vote for the vesting of such a power in the government.

Mr. FORKE: If I understand this matter rightly, the right hon. leader of the Opposition would have the money to be spent each year placed in the Estimates for that year and the same each subsequent year until the expenditure is completed. When I heard the explanation made by the minister I really was inclined to favour his view, but upon hearing the arguments afterwards advanced I cannot see that much harm would be done by adopting the method advocated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The House will likely meet in December or January, at any rate sufficiently early to enable the voting of the sum required for the ensuing year. I can also see the force of the objection advanced that this is a separate bill and that the money will not appear in the Estimates, the result being somewhat misleading. I would not count so much on that, however; but I do not know that the principle is a very good one of voting a lump sum for three years. It would be all right to have it stated that the estimated cost of these lines would be so much in three years, but I would rather see the amount for each year voted as required. I make this statement with a good deal of hesitation, because the subject is new to me. I am not acquainted with the rules and methods of procedure in voting money, and if any members behind me think differently it will not make any difference. In fact, I have not had enough experience in the matter to enable me to express what might be called a definite opinion, but that is my present view of it and I take it that I will vote that way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not only are the present rules and the ordinary procedure being departed from, but the minister is not yet sure of his own bill, not yet sure of his own moneys; he wants to be able to turn his funds here, lengthen his mileage there, or contract it in the other direction. He takes complete control unto himself. We have a section here which ordinarily would bind the minister and bind parliament to vote the sums of money required. But I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to this section so that they will know what they are doing:

The mileage of the said lines of railway—

And remember, your $40,000 is to be fixed on that mileage.

—and the cost of construction thereof, as mentioned or referred to in the schedule of this act, are merely estimated distances and costs for the information of parliament, and shall not be taken to restrict the minister in the issuance of such certificates nor the company in the performancee of the work of construction and completion nor in the issue of its securities.

The truth is that someone is determined that the whole of this matter is to be left up in the air for somebody to handle just in the way somebody wants to handle it. When the minister gets an omnibus power like this, how is he going to see that the public funds are not switched from one purpose to another? I indicate to him what happened in the case of the Hotel Scribe, and he says the auditors can look after it. Well, the point is the auditors did not look after it in that case; the transfer of funds was made; the illegal arrangement was entered into. And here we are enabling this thing to be done on a large scale; the control of parliament is removed.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is making a mountain out of a molehill. In the case of subsidies for which he has voted, payments have been based on the reports of engineers as to the progress estimates. These subsidies were given to private companies, and the

powers were the same as those for which the Canadian National, the people's company, are now asking. Suppose a line for which provision is made as to a specific distance and so on has to be constructed a half mile or a mile longer in order to get a better entry into a town, or to escape a big bridge, or for some other good reason. If this power is not given that extra mile or half mile could not be built unless we first came to parliament and got the authority to build it. Does parliament want that? Quite often a circuitous route is followed in order to get into a town or municipality in the most desirable way, and unless the minister be given some such power as this you might have to stop your line a mile out of town. The power asked for is no more than parliament has voted time and again to private companies. It is simply a case of our own company now asking the same latitude in the construction of its own lines.

Amendment (Mr. Meighen) negatived: Yeas, 15; Nays, 45.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Guarantee of securities of other lines up to $40,000 per mile.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, I propose to move a similar amendment to clause 5. I am quite certain the committee will vote to give the government power to commit the country to as much one year as it wishes, to as much the next year as it wishes, and so on, without any return to the country at all. But I will put myself on record; I will put all hon. members on record if I can. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) that there be added to this clause the following words:

Provided that the amount so to be guaranteed shall first be included in the estimates and voted by parliament for that purpose.

Amendment (Mr. Meighen) negatived: Yeas, 14; Nays, 51.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Nature and form of securities to be approved by Governor in Council, and signed by Minister of Finance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are now coming to the sections which put in concrete form just what we have been saying. We have on the one hand the guarantees to be given under this act, and on the other hand the guarantees given under the vote already made by this House. Now I ask my hon. friend what portion of the main vote is for a similar purpose to what we have here.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can inform my hon. friend that there is nothing in the $73,000,000 vote passed this year except for betterments and co-ordination between the various lines. There was nothing for building.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If it is, it is different to any other vote we have had. It may have been prepared with that end in view. I would go further and say that if there is no construction whatever contemplated in the vote this year of $73,000,000 it is a bigger vote than we had last year. I asked my hon. friend for full particulars as to that vote. I did get a subdivision from him, and the day I got it I wrote to him pointing out that it was not at all full and did not give definite details as to what we were voting. I wonder if he has any objection to giving now the information asked for, or whether the information is to be withheld from parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: We prepared what we understood my hon. friend wanted and we gave that to him. Further details are being prepared, but it will take some little time to get that done. My hon. friend knows that in the operation and management of any big railway system the estimates presented to the board of railway directors are not inflexible in their application, because the directors could not meet any exigency if they were unable to make any change from their first plans. I think my hon. friend will find if he looks into the operation and management and even the betterments of any of the great railway systems that while generally they have to proceed along certain lines, exigencies might arise which might make a difference altogether in the original plans, and if the appropriation were inflexible the management would be practically precluded from operating successfully. I do not mean that they should be wide open but there must be a certain amount of flexibility, particularly in the operation and management and even in the betterments of a railway.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend knows perfectly well what I want. How the situation looks to me at present, and I indicated it at a previous sitting of the House, is this: We have got a vote within $4,000,000 of the whole vote of last year. We had a deficit running into several million dollars, and now according to the statement my hon. friend made to the House, and I suppose the statement is true, and I want to continue thinking the statement is true, he showed that instead of that deficit he had a surplus of $4,000,000; but notwithstanding that

surplus of $4,000,000 and notwithstanding the fact that the estimates this year, as we have been told, do not include five cents for construction there is only a difference of $4,000,000 between the vote this year and last. My hon. friend talks about elasticity. I think there has been a great deal too much elasticity. I believe if there had not been such a lot of elasticity the amount used could not have been used. My hon. friend asks me what was done. I know that we have had pages and pages of details giving us information as to the estimates to be voted before they were brought down to the House, and my hon. friend must have those details. If the work is being carried on in the way it used to be, the minister and the department is given full information as to the commitments here, there and everywhere. Why, it is a matter of hours going through those details, and if the proper details have been given my hon. friend for the purposes of this vote there is no difficulty in him giving that information to the House. He can table the information now in two minutes because he has it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would my hon. friend table all the details of notes he had from his department?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly I would give the details.

Mr. GRAHAM: He never did, and that information was never asked for before.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would certainly detail every bit of information I had leading to an estimate. My hon. friend has those details and he has not given me the information. Now we might just as well know where we are about it. The department have the details and there is only one reason for not giving them, and that reason is that moneys that are voted for this purpose can be applied to that. That is just what my hon. friend calls elasticity, and that is just what is absolutely wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is not one iota of change this year from last year or any other year. My hon. friend from his own intimate knowledge knows that there are a lot of things he never gave to the House and a lot of things that nobody ever asks for in the House. I say quite candidly I would have notes. He did himself many a time have notes from his subordinates, but he would not lay them on the Table. They are notes of particular information for the minister. My hon. friend has asked me questions by the score to-day that never were asked before in this House by any other member. In his time he never pretended to give any such information to the House. I have been a member of the House as long as he has, and I have put through some railway estimates in my time, more than he ever did, and never in my time were the details that were given to the minister in his book in order to answer questions, placed on the Table of the House or asked to be placed on the Table of the House. There are many things in that book that are not public property. There are many things in it for the information of the minister alone, and my hon. friend knows that.

10 p.m.

Now as to showing a surplus, that was not to glorify the present government or the National Railway Board, because that was the result of the work of my hon. friend's board except from the month of October. If we had wished to minimize what they had done we could have made it appear very bad last year and make it look good this year, but we gave an honest statement of what had occurred, and it was to the credit of the board headed by Mr. Hanna. The credit was not taken for this by the government or the government's board. I tried to get every possible bit of information. I said we were endeavouring to make another statement. We sent my hon. friend one. I thought, and my deputy thought, it covered everything. Now he asks that we place on the Table of the House private information,—I say semi-private information,—some of it absolutely public, given to the minister in order to answer every question, right or wrong, incidental or otherwise that might be asked, and he asks that that be placed on the Table of the House—something never heard of in the world before.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows very well that the answer is not at all in line with the argument I made. I made no complaint whatever about the surplus being discussed.

Mr. GRAHAM: If he intimated anything. he hoped it was true—an intimation that we have falsified the books.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said I hoped it was true but the figures brought down tend to show, if they do not absolutely show, that it was not true. We have a betterment from $16,000,000 of a loss to an operating surplus of $4,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of $3,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very well, take $3,000,000. It was four in the statement

according to my memory, and in my hon. friend's statement too, if I am wrong I wish to be corrected.

Mr. GRAHAM: For the calendar year, approximately three million.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister corrected me when I made it three million in my remarks immediately following his speech, and he said it was four.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps we both got a little muddled as between the calendar year and the fiscal year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. GRAHAM: The railway books are closed at the end of the calendar year, we discussed these matters in the House up to March 31, and I gave a lot of details in the statement I presented to the House of the material bought in this calendar year of 1923 that did not apply to last year at all; but I gave the statement up to March 31.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Whether it be four or three, there is a difference on the one hand of twenty million and on the other hand of nineteen million. I am not quarrelling with that statement, I am accepting it and hoping it is true, irrespective of what my hon. friend says when he puts in his estimate this year. If the operation of the railway has improved as much as the auditors show it has what on earth is the reason for showing such an amount in charges against the estimates of last year, unless every single thing that could possibly be included, whether it is for this or that purpose, be applied irrespective of how it is voted? That is what I am talking about. I think the House has a right to know the particular thing we are voting money for, and to know whether it has been applied for that purpose or not. My hon. friend says that information was never laid on the table.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not in my time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether it was asked for or not. I know that no information in connection with my estimates asked for was refused by me, and I know I had it for the purpose of making up my mind what would go through, as far as the Department of Finance was concerned. What is it that is confidential in this? What item is confidential in connection with the estimates? My hon. friend knows there is none. That has not anything to do with the amount of the contract, the details of management and the like. There is no use getting these things mixed up with the estimates. They are entirely different, and I ask, when did we refuse to give any information asked for, having regard to an estimate before the House?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have never said my hon. friend did. I have said it was absolutely contrary to practice to ask the minister to place his book of information given to him on various matters on the Table of the House. It never was done in my time, and never asked for till to-day. An information asked for by hon. members concerning my estimates when they were going through was given just as my hon. friend states was done in the case of his estimates. Now he asks me to place on the Table of the House the book prepared for me, with all the side lines and everything else, concerning the information I had in my possession as to my estimates. I am prepared to give any information with regard to my estimates, if I can get it. But this information he asks for never was placed on the Table of the House. He would not think of such a thing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only reason I suggested it was because the minister said he had the information. He said it would take a long time to make the statement. I wanted to get it before the House adjourned. If he does not want to table his estimate, then let him prepare the statement. But I never had an estimate which I was interested in that I would have objected to produce, nor would I have been ashamed to table the fullest information that I had in connection with it. I again say—and I challenge my hon. friend to deny it—that no such information was refused at any time. Now the minister does not want to put the book on the Table. I only suggested that, so as to make it a little easier for him. It is not necessary to make a long statement, but there is far more in the book than there would be in the statement. I still think parliament is entitled to have the particulars of the money voted. My hon. friend was going to give me a statement. I wrote to him over a week ago, pointing out where the details were not given. I have not heard from him since. He tells me the statement is in course of preparation. I hope he will let us have it before the House adjourns.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will try to.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to ask the minister a question. I know that this point has been discussed to-night on a previous section, but I think my question is pertinent and ought to be clearly answered, particularly

in face of the comments made a moment ago by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). Section 8 which is now before the committee empowers the issue of certain securities in a manner which shall be determined by the Governor in Council from time to time, and then it goes on to provide that these securities may be secured by a mortgage or deed of trust, and so forth. From that it would appear that this particular expenditure of some twenty or twenty-five million dollars is to be made in an issue of new securities distinct from those provided for in the issue. What I want to ask the minister is this: Why is it necessary, in connection with this work set forth in the schedule to this bill, to authorize this issue of new securities when, in the estimates we provide for the sum of $73,000,000 in connection with which I read this in subsection (e), of the description:

Construction and betterments: guarantee of securities.

And then it says:

If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more such companies specified by the Governor in Council.

And so forth.

In other words, in the estimates out of the $73,000,000 we are providing for the issue and guarantee of securities for construction, for extension, principal and interest of maturing and matured loans, and so forth. Yet for this particular schedule of branch lines we are making a separate issue of securities which will not appear in the ordinary statements of the government next year, or as an increase, for instance, in the public debt. It will not appear in any definite form. In the past—that is last year and the year before—we had these votes and the public were told that the National Railways had a deficit of a certain amount. Then this amount was segregated into losses on operation, refunding and so forth. These particular works provided for in this bill are not distinct and separate from works being carried on under the Main Estimates. I am quite aware that the minister may reply that this is capital expenditure; as a matter of fact, we have provided in the $73,000,000 item for what is just as clearly capital expenditure as is this item in this bill. I do not wish to weary the committee by asking for information that, perhaps, has been given already. Yet I have failed to see the need of this being done in this particular form, especially since the minister has refused to make provision in the estimates. I would have no particular objection to this bill, if the actual expenditure of the money to provide for the work were contained in the estimates from year to year, but that has been decided in clauses 4 and 7. The minister has refused to include those in the estimates, and he makes the provision in this form. I do not wish the minister to answer if he has already done so; but I do not think this has been answered. I should like the minister to explain why we have capital expenditures in the main Estimates, and this item appearing in a different form in the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine it would not be satisfactory to parliament if, under the appropriation that we have, we launched out on a great construction scheme such as this.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Any work that was done under the powers of a guarantee, or issuing of securities, or estimates is work in connection with co-ordination, minor work, betterments and all that kind of thing, no large construction of the dimensions of this. For practical purposes it is thought better to take this special construction in this way, and I believe parliament will find this the better way. As regards information, the Minister of Railways in the annual statement that he makes before coming to parliament with his ordinary estimates, will be compelled to give in detail what has been done during the year in this connection, and the public accounts committee will have an opportunity of going into the matter. This railway system amounting to 22,600 miles is a new thing, and we have to do these big things in a somewhat different way from what we did when we had just the Intercolonial. This system is many thousands of miles longer than it was a year ago. This method is only for practicability, there is nothing whatever to be hidden, and I do not think my hon. friend believes that anything is to be hidden. Everything possible will be given in the minister's statement, which, I believe, will be the proper place in which to give the information.

Mr. STEVENS: These items in the estimates to which I have referred, will all appear in the public accounts, and will be placed before parliament at the end of the year. These items in the bill will not necessarily be included in the public accounts unless in some form, possibly as a supplement. That might be done, but so far as I can see, under the law, it is not necessary to include them in the public accounts.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that it is, that any expenditure of public money must

go into the public accounts, and surely expenditure on these lines will get into the public accounts.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think the minister is any more sure about that than I am, and I am very suspicious about it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed by my deputy, who knows something about the routine, that these accounts must go into the public accounts.

Mr. STEVENS: Then why cannnot the minister bring down an estimate, just as has been done in the case of the other items? Let me give another example. There is in the Main Estimates, an item for principal and interest for maturing and matured loans, secured or unsecured. In other words, you provide in the Main Estimates for paying off principal, because that is what this amounts to. In this other case, we are incurring a principal charge. Why could that not be covered in the estimates, as well as the matter of paying off a principal charge? There is no difference in the principle of the thing. That is the point I want to make. This has already been suggested and turned down; but I would still suggest that this bill should pass as a general authority to do these works and then a special estimate, not necessarily included in the Main Estimates, but a special item in the Supplementary Estimates should be brought in for this year for, say $10,000,000. I wish the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) would listen to me, if he would be good enough, on this point. Every year that I have been in this House we pass ordinary Public Works estimates covering contracts which are already let for amounts away in excess of the amount voted. For instance, we let a contract for a million dollars for some public work. All we vote during the year is, perhaps, $500,000, knowing that during the year we shall require only that amount of money on the contract. The contract is let; the country is committed to the work; but the amount required for the year is estimated, and the amount inserted in the estimate. That is exactly what we are asking should be done in this case. Grant the authority to the railway company to go on with the capital expenditures, and then bring in a supplementary estimate covering the amount you want to spend this year. In my estimation, there is no difference in principle in providing the amounts in the Main Estimates in a proper and ordinary parliamentary fashion, and that called for in this bill in a special and extraordinary manner.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to delay my bill, but I have tried to point out the practicability of the matter. If my hon. friend has had any experience in public works, he will see one of the difficulties. This happens time and time again, and it should not happen with railway construction, particularly in the position in which the country is as regards labour. Construction should not be held up. What happens is that contractors are allowed to go on after an appropriation has run out; they finance themselves, and the cost of that public work is the cost plus the interest on the money which they advance. The counry in this way loses money. If the United States were to build the Welland Canal, they would pass a lump sum, and they would have to give an account each year. Until, however, the appropriation was exhausted, they would not have to come back to Congress for a further appropriation.

Mr STEVENS: My hon. friend is not answering my argument at all. He is condemning the whole system of our estimates. I am not discussing that at all. That is the regular sysem, and I question the minister's expression of opinion as to its not being as good as that of the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM: For large works, I am free to say that I believe it is not. I have given my hon. friend one reason; I will give him another. Under the United States system, where a lump sum is voted, the work can go on without cessation and contractors can take advantage of every situation. With us, the work is sometimes halted for reasons pointed out by my hon. friend. With large works, our system is not the best for this reason: For a work that will cost, say $200,000, an amount of, perhaps, only $10,000 is voted. Unless some person reads Hansard with the explanation, he will believe that the work is going to cost only $10,000. Then, perhaps, he looks up Hansard the next year, and he finds there is $25,000 or $50,000 more. I believe the safe way in the public interest, is to put down at once the estimate for the entire amount, and to account each year to parliament. That is really what this is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend evidently thinks all these payments are to be shown in the public accounts. Do the payments made by the Canadian National Railways appear in the public accounts?

Mr. GRAHAM: The amounts we advance them certainly do appear in the accounts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, but my hon. friend knows that is quibbling.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all. I object to the use of that word "quibbling". As in the case of the Merchant Marine which was under discussion the other day and in regard to which the Auditor General's report for the past three or four years was turned up, the advances that we make are really loans and they appear in the public accounts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the payments as such on the National Railways do not appear in the public accounts, what appear in the public accounts are the payments which we make to the system. Of course, the deputy may say "sure," but we do not want that; we want to get the exact facts as to where the money goes. What the public accounts show is that so much money under such a vote is given to the railways. That is all, we do not get anything else. But that is not what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) was asking for, nor is it what my hon. friend says. I know that the minister replied in absolute good faith to the hon. member that these advances appear in the public accounts, but they do not.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Advances pending issue of guaranteed securities.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister can tell us how the money will be raised, how the accounts are to be charged, what appropriations will be necessary in order to enable the work to be done, whether the funds will be raised by overdraft, or in what other way.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might not, say, this week be an opportune time to issue securities for the work. This section gives the Minister of Finance power to advance a loan temporarily to the company for immediate needs, the amount to be reimbursed the moment the securities are sold; and it is in the interests of the company that the best possible price shall be received. The sale of securities will be altogether controlled by the Minister of Finance and the Canadian National Railways, and this section gives to the Minister of Finance the power to go to the bank and borrow for the work to be done.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that this is what the Minister of Finance will have to do in any case. The section simply gives him the power to go to the bank and borrow money.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. GRAHAM: I should think he would have to do that.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914, by providing:

1. That a minimum standard of fat in butter be established;

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered by proclamation to permit the importation, manufacture and sale of renovated butter in Canada;

3. That the manufacture, importation, selling, offering or having in possession for sale of milk or cream which contains any fat or oil other than that of milk be prohibited;

4. That regulations may be made respecting (a) records being kept by manufacturers and dealers in butter, renovated butter and cheese, and for the examination of such records by inspectors; (b) the importation, manufacture, inspection, marking, advertising and sale of renovated butter; (c) the registration of all cheese factories and creameries in Canada and the compulsory use of an assigned number on the product of each factory or on the packages containing said product;

5. That penalties for violation of the regulations be increased, and methods established for proving the guilt of persons charged with infractions of the act as amended, and for the procedure to be followed in all such cases.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When this resolution was last before the committee there seemed to be rather general objection on all sides of the House to the second paragraph. I move therefore that section 2 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS: Does section 3 cover "filled" milk?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. In line 2 of section 4—now section 3,—the words "renovated butter" must be struck out, as also paragraph (b) with regard to the importation, manufacture, inspection, marking, advertising and sale of renovated butter. I move that the new section 3 be amended accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 241 to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

EXPORT ACT—PULPWOOD

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend section seven of the Export Act, chapter fifty of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as enacted by chapter thirty of the statutes of 1914, by providing that the Governor in Council may by regulation prohibit the exportation from Canada of pulpwood of the variety, kind, place of origin or having the particulars of identification or ownership or production described in the regulation.

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

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I am a good deal in sympathy with the general principle of the resolution, but I should like my hon. friend to inform us whether he has made up his mind at all as to the regulations to be made respecting ownership and the like.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid the resolution can hardly be explained better than in its own words. It is to give the government power to make regulations having in view the prohibition of export of pulpwood. It might be a general prohibitory regulation without any qualification, or a regulation prohibiting export under certain conditions. For example, it has been suggested that it would be wise and expedient to exempt farmers who have pulpwood to clear off their land. We have not any plan in detail. If a plan is evolved we might put it in operation in a general way or subject to qualification; this would be a matter for further inquiry. The wording of the resolution implies that it may be desirable to distinguish respecting quality and character of wood.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that this matter will receive the government's immediate attention and will not be tied up by the commission that was referred to at an earlier date.

Mr. FIELDING: Under the terms of this resolution we would not be restricted, but much can be said in favour of having the report of a commission before acting.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rose to express the hope that my hon. friend would really go on with the prohibition. I do not think he will gain any further information from a commission. The questions of ownership and so on would be just as real—if there is any real difficulty about them—after as before the report. I know my hon. friend is conversant with the whole matter.

Mr. FIELDING: I can assure my hon. friend that there are two sides to the question. Sometimes a commission has a good effect in educating the public in a matter which is not generally understood. I think there is more than one side to the question, and I do not wish to commit myself beyond that at the present stage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend will go a little further and say that if there is to be a commission it will proceed with all speed and submit an early report.

Mr. FIELDING: It is desirable. More than that I could not say.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): The prohibition of the export of pulpwood from farms owned by settlers would be very serious in the province of Quebec, especially in my own constituency. When new land is taken up by a settler he must clear it and dispose of the wood in some way or another. If his export to the United States is forbidden, he is at the mercy of the local dealer, if there is one, otherwise he has no market at all. The legislature of Quebec has refused to go that far; it prohibits the export of wood from Crown lands only. I presume the Dominion government will be guided very largely in this matter by the feeling in my province as expressed by the legislature. I certainly would view with alarm any action taken by this government to prevent the farmer or the settler from exporting his wood to the United States or anywhere else, because this is his only source of revenue until he has a crop to sell. Therefore I hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will give us an assurance that these settlers will be exempt from any such prohibition.

Mr. MICHAUD: Mr. Speaker, there is not a county in all the Dominion where there are so many new settlers who have gone into the wilderness in the last ten years and established new homes as in my constituency. Along the National Railway about five hundred families have settled recently and cleared their holdings, and now they are looking to the American market to export their pulpwood. They are getting a better price across the line than they are getting on the Canadian side. These people expect that the law will remain as it is, and I hope that when the Minister of Finance gets the report of the commission that is to be appointed, he will take the requests of these people into consideration. I speak not only on behalf of the new settlers, but on behalf also of farmers in my constituency who own land

and what might be called lots in second, third and fourth tiers and which are being retained for the purpose of cutting the wood thereon. They make a business out of it; they export these woods to the very best market. I know that many pulp mills in Canada own their own land, but they also buy from the farmers. I ask that these new settlers as well as the longer established farmers be protected by the minister in this respect.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should think that the minister could look after both interests without trouble. The mill owners who are given certain rights in connection with these great national resources have some obligation to the state, I do not know why the regulations should not go further than they do, and I do not know why the farmers and others should not be assured of a market for their pulpwood. After all, it is in the interests of the pulp people to preserve the forests; in many cases they have not much as it is. The pulpwood rates in the States are always low. The railway haul from Canadian points to American points is always expensive. It would be no very great hardship on the paper companies of this province if they had to buy the settlers' wood at a price which would equal the American price less the freights that the farmer would otherwise be out. The farmer would lose nothing and the country would be able to conserve its resources.

Mr. POWER: Is it the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the government should fix a maximum price or a minimum price for the purchase of pulpwood?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, there is a market price; the matter of regulation would always be in the hands of the government. If they thought the farmers were being unfairly treated, they could act accordingly.

Mr. POWER: Who fixes the market price?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The public demand in the States is fixing it every day.

Mr. POWER: It varies from county to county.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It varies, but on what? Not on what affects the main price, but on the freight rates in that particular county and also on the man who is making the contracts in that particular county.

Mr. POWER: It varies with the man who is making the contracts.

[Mr. Michaud.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course the government cannot look after all that, but there is a general scale in the market that is now being talked about, that is, the American market. It costs just so much to get into that market, and it should be no hardship to the Canadian manufacturer to take that pulpwood without the cost of the freight.

Mr. EVANS: What is the real purpose of prohibiting the export of pulpwood?

Mr. FIELDING: It is argued that the forests are becoming destroyed, that we need to put on some general restrictions, and particularly that this is a very valuable article that we need at home. There is much to be said on both sides of the question, but generally speaking the argument is that we should use it at home instead of exporting it. I am giving the current view on the subject; just how far we may act on this resolution is a question that remains to be considered.

Mr. EVANS: There are two sides to the question. One is that we are asked to prohibit the exportation of pulpwood in order to preserve our forests.

Mr. FIELDING: Anything which diminishes the cut.

Mr EVANS: But we ignore the very element that is laying bare millions of acres of our forests every year, something that is quite preventable, and that is fire. In prohibiting the export of pulpwood we give a monopoly to our own manufacturers and enable them to fix a price. They are the only ones who will benefit. The result will not be to preserve our forests; there will be none the less wood cut; there will be no less devastation of the forest areas. We may bring in more pulp and paper companies from foreign lands, or we may cause more paper mills to be established by people in our country, but our forests will not be preserved. What does the minister propose in order to give fair play to those who are now owners of pulpwood? Take the case of the farmer who cuts a little pulpwood to keep the pot boiling during the winter; is he to be at the mercy of one concern, one combine in Canada, so far as the price of his wood is concerned? Who is going to regulate the matter? There might be a great unfairness in this proposed legislation. A little while ago we talked about giving some advantage to our newspaper proprietors or to our Canadian magazines, but it seems to me that this provision is bound to increase even more largely the cost to

every paper user in Canada. I repeat that this provision will not bring about any greater preservation of our forests. If we want to conserve our forests we had better get after the fires.

Mr. MacLAREN: I notice that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) holds the view that should an embargo be placed upon the export of pulpwood the opportunity of the sale of that wood would be lost to many of our farmers; and I suppose that applied more particularly to the county of Gaspé. The hon. member must disregard the market that is now available in Canada. I cannot quite see how he entertains the view that the placing of an embargo on the export of pulpwood would result in substantially the elimination of the market. I do not think that is the case.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): If you bar out the American purchaser our farmers will be at the mercy of the Canadian paper makers, who will pay any price they like. Gaspé is far removed from Toronto and other places where they have mills, and our railway accommodation is very poor. The result of any such embargo as is proposed might cause those engaged in this industry to flock into the cities or go to the United States, as they are doing even now.

Mr. MacLAREN: I must confess I do not share that outlook. First of all, if the embargo is put on there will still be the market as it exists to-day; there will be an increased market, as I believe. The paper mills will increase their output for sale in this country rather than for export and manufacture into paper across the line. The hon. member for Bonaventure says there will be a lack of competition and therefore a low price for the pulpwood. I think there are too many pulp mills in Canada to-day to admit of any fixed price. The putting on of an embargo will increase the number of our pulp factories; it will prevent the establishing of any set price, and will lead to competition as it does in any other industry. At the present time I presume that the hon. member for Bonaventure would not suggest that there is a combine among the pulp mills in Canada. Still less is it likely to be the case in the future when there will be an increase in the number of pulp factories.

Mr. LEGER: I would draw the attention of the minister to the situation in our part of the country. In the county which I represent most of the land is Crown land. The farmers have wood on their land and almost every year cut a certain number of cords of pulpwood which they offer for sale in the best market. For the last few years we have had to ship our pulpwood to the United States. In the latter part of last summer right in the little town where I live there were over two thousand cords shipped to the United States by water. These people are poor and have to work hard and I do not think we should deprive them of this chance to sell a few cords of pulpwood in the best market and if the market is not sufficient in our part of the country they should be allowed the chance to export to the United States. I would therefore ask the minister to reconsider the situation and not to do anything that will place at a disadvantage these poor people who have to work very hard for their living and who are making only a few dollars a year in this way. This measure is certain to cut their living, and I think that it should not be made applicable to pulpwood on Crown lands.

Mr. FORTIER: I want to support the views expressed by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). The settlers in the constituency which I represent will certainly suffer if this measure goes into effect. There is probably a remark that should be made as to the different kinds of pulpwood that can be cut. It has been said by a previous speaker that the mills in Canada would buy all the pulpwood of our forests. For spruce and balsam there is a good local market I am told, but for poplar and basswood there is no market in this country or a very restricted market, and if this prohibition of export goes into effect the settlers will certainly suffer and not be in a position to sell all the pulpwood on their farms. Consequently I trust that the resolution will not be carried into effect.

Mr. MANION: I should like to say a few words in support of the resolution because I believe that generally speaking it is worth trying. It is quite possible that the point made by my hon. friend from Saskatoon may have to be taken into consideration later, and that is one of the reasons why I believe the matter is better left in the hands of the Governor in Council, because if it was found that the farmer was really suffering because of this restriction on the export of pulpwood he should get consideration. I think that would be the desire of everybody. But we must not forget that the real market for pulp and paper is in the United States. Last year our exports of pulp, paper and forest products to the United States amounted to something like

$200,000,000, and the competition for pulpwood will go on even though the export of pulpwood is discontinued. I made it my business recently because my part of the country is very much interested in this matter—we have many pulp and paper mills there, and the farmers are cutting and selling pulpwood from their land just as they are in the county of Bonaventure and other sections of the country that have been spoken of—I made it my business to make certain inquiries among those in a position to know and the general opinion was that if the export of pulpwood is prohibited the price will not decrease, because the internal competition among the mills is sufficient to keep prices to about the same level as at present. Yet if it were found that that was not the case and that the farmers were being injured by the fact that export was prohibited it would be a wise precaution on the part of the government to protect the farmer to that extent. But I am influenced more by the articles of Mr. Frank Barnjum. I have had the privilege of reading many of his articles for a long period now, and he knows the pulp and paper business I believe from the bottom up. I believe that he is absolutely sincere in making a stand at his own expense in the interests of the forests of this country. He has not only told us in his writings but I have had the pleasure of having him tell me personally on a number of occasions that one of the greatest cures for the depletion of our forests is this very action that the minister proposes to take. I did not know that the minister was going to bring in this resolution. I had not seen any notice to that effect, and I had intended putting a resolution on the order paper next year along similar lines myself for the good of the country. I repeat, if we find that the farmers are suffering because of an order of this kind I believe that the prohibition of export should be taken off, but in the meantime I think that the minister is bringing forward legislation which should be supported by this House and be given a fair trial.

Mr. POWER: I rise to oppose this resolution. I may say at the outset that I am somewhat interested in that should the resolution pass my somewhat attenuated pocketbook will be still further attenuated. I may say also in order to be perfectly frank with the House that if they consider that my judgment is not altogether disinterested they may at any rate give me credit for some knowledge of the question that is being discussed.

[Mr. Manion.]

In the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario at the present time the exportation of pulpwood from Crown lands is prohibited. This measure will have for effect the prohibition of the exportation of pulpwood cut from off private lands, that is,

11 p.m. lands held in fee simple, lands the entire property of which is vested in the owner. As the House is aware under the laws of Ontario, and I think notably in the province of Quebec certain very large tracts of timber lands are held under what is called license. The license amounts to a lease for which a yearly rental is paid, and this lease is practically everlasting provided the lessee fulfils his obligations and pays his rent. But what this measure aims at is to take control of the timber belonging to the owner of the land. It is just as if the government were to say to some of my Progressive friends from the West: Every bushel of wheat which you grow on your farms must be sold in Canada to the Canadian millers. I ask the government to tell us why there should be a discrimination between the farmer and the holder of timber lands. Take a farmer on one lot and alongside of him a man who owns a timber lot. The farmer may export to the four corners of the globe. The owner of the timber may only sell to five, six, ten or fifteen paper companies, most of whom have timber limits extending over an area of many miles and if the price does not suit them they can cut their own timber. Should this legislation go into force I foresee that the price of pulpwood in Quebec, at any rate, and I should imagine in Ontario, will hardly pay for the cost of taking it out of the bush. It has been said I think that arrangements are to be made to exempt the farmer from this prohibition. How these regulations are to be made has not been explained to me, nor do I quite conceive of any means to be taken by the government to make such regulations. For instance, they say that a man who owns 100 acres of timber land is a farmer, and the man who owns 1,000 acres is not a farmer.

We have in Quebec seigneurial lands, some of them held since the early days of the French colonies, granted by the Kings of France. In 1854, it is true, a great many of the feudal rights of these seigneurs were taken away, but even at that time compensation was given, and it was not thought proper to destroy the rights of ownership in the holdings of the seigneurs. These lands are held in some cases by the same family; in other cases they have been transferred from one to another for two or three centuries, and they will be affected by this regulation. In some

cases these seigneurs are farming their own lands, but they may have so many acres of timber lands held in fee simple. They may be farmers. Are the government going to say that because a man has more than 200 acres he shall not be treated as a farmer? Are they going to take away from these men rights which have been held for generations? To give an example of the manner in which some of these seigneurs have carried on their business, I quote the Seigneur of Lotbiniere, in the county of my hon. friend from Lotbiniere. The De Lotbiniere family have been there for a number of generations. The late governor, I think, of British Columbia, Sir Henry Joly de Lotbiniere, took a great interest in reforestation and forestry questions. He set to work many years ago, and planted trees all over the estate, brought experts over from Germany and other countries in Europe; so that to-day he has a very fine estate, and the land is worth a great deal of money. Is it fair or just for this government to simply, by a stroke of the pen, say to the present owner of this estate, "You may not export this timber" and thus diminish the value of the seigneury by about one-fourth? I submit it practically means confiscation. It is neither fair, just nor right.

It has been said we are taking this step to preserve our forests, yet, if I understand the meaning of the minister aright, we are to allow the settlers to continue to ship the pulpwood which they cut to the United States but we are to prevent the seigneurs and other freeholders from doing so. Without having the figures before me I will venture to suggest to the government that at least 60 per cent of the pulpwood which is now being exported to the United States is being exported from the settlers' land. In a great majority of cases large companies or other people who own freehold lands have been very careful about getting rid of them because they have a considerable value owing to the very fact that pulpwood can be exported and with very few exceptions they have been carrying on reforestation and endeavouring, as it were, to farm their holdings. In view of the fact that within the last two or three weeks the eastern provinces have been devastated by vast conflagrations, and in view of the fact that the timber which was affected thereby must be cut next winter, otherwise it will have to rot in the bush, we will find in the spring of 1924 large quantities of pulpwood on the market. If I would be allowed to make a suggestion to the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick, I would say that, instead of prohibiting the exportation, they should permit the exportation of pulpwood to the United States, at least for two or three years, in order to stabilize the pulpwood market; so that this timber which has been destroyed, or partially so, by fire and which will be eventually destroyed unless it is cut within one year may be exported to the United States and that the price will be, at least, sufficient to cover the cost of cutting down and taking it to the railways.

There is another phase of the situation. We have in this House, and particularly on this side of the House, been talking about and arguing at great length for freer trade, and for doing away with the barriers of trade, asking that we be given a chance to go into the American market. Here we are putting up, not a tariff but a Chinese wall, which prevents us selling to the American market. I submit we are inconsistent, and that we are not carrying out our programme, our platform and our promises. Should such legislation be passed, we will be denying the very principles on which we are supposed to stand and we will be going back on everything the Liberal party holds sacred.

There is another phase of the situation. During the war and shortly afterwards I remember the chamber in the Victoria Museum building ringing with vehement utterances in which we decried government by order in council. Is there any more striking example of government by order in council than this resolution which is being brought down?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. POWER: We have a blanket resolution which tells us nothing, and simply says that regulations will be made regarding pulpwood. I have every confidence in the government but I am sorry to say it must have been badly advised when it brought down this resolution. I have no doubt the time has come when a commission should be appointed to study the question. I have no objection to a commission, I think it would be a good thing. The people of this country have much to learn with regard to pulpwood and its exportation. Let us appoint a commission and let them make a full study of the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member know of any potential commissioners who are still at large?

Mr. POWER: No, but if the hon. member will give me the names of any I may recommend them. If the government announces its intention of naming a commission, there will be no difficulty in finding the com-

missioners. Let the government make a full and complete study of the question and if, after a study of the question, the commission brings in a report that the exportation of pulpwood shall be prohibited, I think the majority of the people will be willing to back up that statement, but until such time as the government has fuller information than it has, and until such time as this House has full information, I submit we should not enter hastily into any such legislation as that now before us.

Mr. BAXTER: This subject requires I think and will obtain the most careful consideration of this committee. I want to say something from the standpoint of the province of New Brunswick. I do not pretend to know the whole lumber or pulpwood situation in New Brunswick; but I can say to members of the House that, as in Quebec, there are the government lands which have unfortunately been most disastrously ravaged, first by the bud worm and in the last two weeks by fire. Our resources in that respect are considerably affected, and the government of that province must be seriously concerned with the question of what policy it shall adopt. We have also privately owned lands. For some reason the policy of New Brunswick has been to prohibit the export of pulpwood cut from government limits; but that prohibition has not been and, perhaps, could not be applied to privately owned lands, on all production of privately owned lands where there is not enough to support one pulp mill, because to impose a prohibition of exportation in absolute terms, would be really to throw people into the hands of local buyers. The government of New Brunswick has not compelled that course to be taken. Where an owner of freehold lands has also been a leaseholder from the province, the government has permitted him to export from Crown lands a quantity equal to that which he might have taken off his privately-owned lands, but so that the total quantity would not be greater than that which he sent out of the province. It was necessary to pursue a course of that kind. The policy I speak of is the one which was first adopted by New Brunswick. Then a succeeding government prohibited the exportation absolutely, and they had to come back to the original proposition because of the extreme difficulty of adjusting the pulpwood business.

Under these circumstances, I think legislation by order in council or directly requires the very closest co-operation and concurrence of the provincial governments. This, I think I may say, is a matter of vital importance to the government of New Brunswick as regards revenue. I know the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will say to me that his government will take all these things into consideratiton. But may I ask: When will they do this? Between now possibly and the next session of parliament. But is it to be expected that any regulations in the nature of absolute prohibition would be brought into effect so quickly as that? Would not a period of time be given to allow the very serious readjustment which must take place of people's business? I would say that an anticipatory note of at least a year would only be fair, and yet I want to see every bit of forest value preserved for the people of this country. So far as the legislation is in that direction, it has my sympathy and it should have my support; but I want it to be brought into operation in such a way as to cause just as little dislocation of industry as possible. Therefore, I think I am right in assuming, and I think the minister will be one of the first in the House to concede that a change of the character ought not to be brought into effect instantaneously or with a notice of only two or three months. If that is conceded, I accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), which I think has great merit, that there should be a commission. I understand the minister is favourable to that. As regards naming commissioners, I do not think that there will be the slightest difficulty in obtaining them without resort to the ranks of party supporters on any of the three sides of this triangular House. One name, that of Mr. Frank Barnjum, stands out pre-eminently. He is a man who has spent a great deal of his money and who has devoted his energy to the work of endeavouring to preserve to the people of Canada that heritage which they possess in standing timber. A man of that character with another similar to him, associated with him, could give a report that would be of value, and it would come in quite time enough if we had it at the next session of parliament. I am not going to inveigh any more strongly than my hon. friend (Mr. Power) has just done, against government by order in council. It is sufficient that the emergency of war has passed, and I think all parties agree that there should be as little government by order in council as there may be. Very much of the administration of the government of the country must be conducted by order in council; but when we come to a matter of such great importance as this, to a complete change of policy, I do not think it would be out of the way to ask that a

definite measure should be laid before and receive the sanction of parliament. Reading this resolution, how do I know, how does any other hon. member know whether this is a move—and it might be a right and proper move—on the part of the Minister of Finance in the direction of bargaining with the United States? It may be simply intended to force them to better terms with regard to their tariff. I would not reprobate it if it were for that purpose. Perhaps the minister cannot state that very publicly, and I would possibly vote for it if that element were in it. On the other hand, how do I know that with the comparatively limited view of the subject that must be taken in government circles, immense injury might not be done, not only to private interests, but to public interests in the provinces which would be principally affected? Therefore I say, before anything is done, there ought to be first a proper investigation. If that investigation is made by competent men and if the recommendation seems at all suitable to the conditions which they find, those recommendations ought, if possible, to be accepted by this House. But even before that, there ought to be an opportunity for discussion, for proper representation, for consideration, before we enter upon this thing which, however praiseworthy it may be in itself, may very easily lead to an absolute dislocation of a very important branch of industry, may stop employment, may drive people to the wall, and may seriously impair in the province from which I come the very funds upon which the government must rely in order to carry on the everyday business of that province. Therefore I join the hon. member for Quebec South in pressing, so far as I may do so, upon the minister the advisability of proceeding now by commission and letting the result of that commission come before the next session of parliament. Then let us have a government policy which will be clear and distinct, which we can debate here and to which, if we see any objection, we can suggest amendments, and perhaps suggest to the government some better course which will do good to all and harm to none.

Mr. LOVETT: I must congratulate the government on the resolution now before the committee dealing with the question of an embargo on pulpwood.

In the recent budget debate, I spoke at some length on the subject of forest conservation; but I wish again to urge on hon. members of this House the great necessity of immediate and drastic steps being taken to conserve our forest wealth, and as a means to this end, to support this resolution which empowers the government to take prompt action.

No element of consideration for what is considered individual rights of the estimated two per cent of Canadian farmers who wish to export pulpwood from Canada should be allowed to blur our vision or influence the hon. members of this House on whom rests the grave responsibility of safeguarding our national interests. This is not a matter of the moment; it is not a matter of respecting minority rights; it is a matter which makes for the weal or woe of Canada in the future. And in the light of clarified vision which will surely come in the future on this question, the parliament of 1923 will either in the future appear as the protector and preserver of Canada's great forest wealth or it will be blackened by its failure to act decisively and promptly in what must be considered a serious situation. We have often heard the argument advanced that the restriction of pulpwood export is a violation of individual rights and liberties.. In answer to this argument let me say that all laws for the benefit of a country as a whole must infringe on personal liberty. Where would this or any other country be if individual liberty of action were not controlled by laws when that action was detrimental to the general good? As well might one say that we should not control the personal liberty of our fishermen by establishing fishing seasons, or of our huntsmen by defining hunting seasons, as well as to say that we should allow pulpwood to be cut from fee lands at the owner's will regardless of the loss to the country as a whole. All are natural resources and as such can never be wholly individually controlled. An embargo on the exporting of pulpwood cut on fee land might apparently work hardships on a small percentage of the estimated farmers who wish to export it but ultimately it would result in public good by forcing pulp and paper companies to locate in Canada, thus increasing the home market for their products, both forest and agricultural and increasing the chances of employment for their children, capitalized industries sharing the weight of taxation under which Canadians labour to-day and will labour for some time to come.

Other countries, notably Norway, Sweden and Finland, the very countries which our Canadians meet as competitors for the world's trade in pulp and paper products have not hesitated to prohibit the export of pulpwood, and these great industrial countries are looking upon Canada with amazement that for a few petty obstacles she is acting the spendthrift with her forest wealth

The United States' capitalists whose business acumen is undoubted will accept this embargo as an evidence of ordinary business sense and already they are preparing for it by buying large tracts of available pulp lands; and they will locate plants here for the manufacture of raw material unless they are still allowed to get it out of the country to be manufactured into the finished article by their own workmen. It is estimated that the United States have only enough timber of their own to supply their mills for five or at most ten years. Are our Canadian forests to be depleted as under present conditions they surely will be by the United States while that country's supply is conserved? These are facts. Let me recite some of them. The original virgin forests of the United States amounted to 830,000,000 acres; at the present time they have only 130,000,000 acres. Their annual deforested areas from all causes total 26,000,000 acres. The United States depends on Canada for 50 per cent of its newsprint and 30 per cent of its pulp. Canada exports yearly of pulpwood 5,000,000 cords. Forest fires in Canada last year totalled 5,000 while the ravages of the bud worm destroyed 150,000,000 cords. The capital invested in Canada in pulp and paper industries approximates $380,000,000, with a yearly productive value of $200,000,000, providing employment for 30,000 people, with wages amounting to $28,000,000. The industry uses 644,805 horsepower or nearly one-third of the developed hydraulic resources of Canada. It is estimated that some of our large pulp and paper plants in Canada have barely five years' supply of wood in sight. In 1920, of Canada's cut of pulpwood, 31 per cent was exported to the value of $16,000,000. If exported as manufactured pulp instead of raw wood, the value would have been $84,000,000 and exported as paper, it would have been $105,000,000. If the collected data of indisputable facts can not convince us of the seriousness of the situation we must admit that as in olden times the Heavens have displayed signs of warning. The dense pall of smoke that has hung over Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific during the past few weeks, pervading even this building, is indubitable evidence of the wiping out of our forests, and their approaching extermination if every possible method is not applied, and quickly applied, to stem this devastation. We must recognize these facts. Our commercial and agricultural prosperity will largely vanish with our forests; our hydraulic powers will be diminished; our farming country will be left bare and arid; our pulp and paper industries forced out of existence by lack of raw material, while Canadian money invested in these industries will be lost. More than that, the exodus of our population in search of employment will be greater. Our game and fur-bearing animals, a source of great wealth to Canada, will be homeless and will disappear, and Canada, the land of primeval forests with their priceless value will be a tragic monument to the blunders of its legislators. This is not a party problem and we should not so consider it. It is far above the realm of party. It reaches down to the very foundation of Canada's national existence, and the way in which we solve it means our continuance as a prosperous people or our speedy retrogression into national bankruptcy. It has been truly said that a dying forest means a dying nation. Let me urge hon. members of all parties in this House to disregard any local situation that may influence their action and support this resolution which authorizes immediate and effective action for the preservation of our forests.

[Mr. Lovett.]

Mr. McBRIDE: I am fully in sympathy with the resolution. If the people of Canada do not look after their own interests and protect their forests, who will? Last fall I was up in the Cariboo country and I saw a lot of men working in the timber. I went over and found about two hundred Japs cutting our forest down. They were towing the logs down to Vancouver and putting them aboard Japanese ships for Japan. What was Canada receiving from her forests? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. POWER: Was this in the form of logs?

Mr. McBRIDE: I said logs.

Mr. POWER: This resolution covers pulpwood only.

Mr. McBRIDE: Well, what is pulpwood but logs cut into small portions? I have seen in British Columbia the finest logs ever taken out for pulpwood. You do not grow the class of timber down here that we grow in British Columbia. Some years ago I noticed that on every dollar's worth of manufactured goods shipped out of the United States 85 per cent represented labour, while for every dollar's worth shipped out of Canada only 10 per cent represented labour. It is about time that we manufactured our natural resources and got the utmost out of them. If this pulpwood exportation is stopped it will only be a few years before the American concerns will be establishing factories on the Canadian side

of the line and giving employment to our people; and that is what we want.

Mr. DICKIE: I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride). I think it is time we also drew the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the exportation of raw material from British Columbia in the form of logs. Ruthless destruction of our forests is proceeding and in another generation the forests of Vancouver island will pretty well have disappeared. I have seen one of the grandest forest areas of America wiped out in one generation,—the forest area of the state of Michigan is now a farming country. We do not want our potentialities to be wasted without getting some proper return. I do not think we fully realize what we lose by the exportation of pulpwood. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken quoted some figures. I have other figures which I think will prove conclusively that it is time we did something.

In 1920, 31 per cent of our pulpwood was exported for which we received in round numbers, $16,000,000. We exported 28 per cent as pulp with a value of $76,000,000; 25 per cent as paper worth $87,000,000. Had the $16,000,000 worth of pulpwood exported—been converted into pulp, it would have had a value of $84,000,000; if into paper, $105,000,000,—making a loss to labour, to capital and to Canada of from $68,000,000 to $89,000,000 in one year.

Surely, Sir, this exportation of raw material is the acme of economic folly. In 1921 we produced 2,180,578 cords of pulpwood which were converted into pulp and paper worth $108,677,520. We exported 1,902,533 cords of pulpwood to the United States for which we received only $14,617,610. "And so the play goes on." The folly of it must be apparent to all honourable members.

In Canada we have invested in pulp and paper plants $380,000,000 and an army of men are employed. Why not keep all raw material at home and with it another capable army of men that is leaving for the United States following our raw products to engage in their manufacture. They are following our raw products just as they are following our $172,000,000 which constitute our adverse trade balance with our American neighbours. We are being bled white by our neighbours. Certainly no company would conduct business along these lines, and no country can persist in doing so and not precipitate national disaster. The cry of the world is for lumber and paper. Let us take full advantage of our splendid opportunities and aim for maximum results. Despite substitutes, the demand for lumber is continually increasing. Yet, Sir, we of British Columbia sit idly by while immense booms of our saw logs are being towed across the line to the state of Washington and our men are following to work in the mills of that state.

It is time we awoke to the necessity of doing something. It is said that if we prohibit the export of pulpwood the Americans might retaliate by placing an embargo on anthracite. I think if we got our house in order this is the best thing that could happen. In Alberta we have immense areas of coal which even at present prices would make it good policy for Ontario to buy in preference to looking to Pennsylvania for her fuel requirements. In British Columbia we also have immense coal areas, but it is out of the question to ship our coal so far east as Ontario. In Nova Scotia there are also immense supplies of coal available which could be placed on the market in Ontario at a price just as cheap as that charged for American coal. Why not burn Canadian coal and so save the many millions of dollars that we pay the Americans every year?

We send our pulpwood over to the American side and our men follow to engage in the work of manufacturing it into paper, which is worth many times more than the raw material. We are simply throwing ourselves into the arms of those people who say, "We do not want a pound of your butter unless you pay an import tax of eight cents a pound." At the same time we allow their butter to come into Canada on payment of a duty of only four cents a pound. Why turn our cheek to these people? For every cord of pulpwood that goes over there we may say that six dollars is lost in labour for every dollar that comes into this country. When we consider that we are losing from $70,000,000 to $90,000,000 by the exportation of pulpwood, is it not time that we quit temporizing and took a bold stand even if somebody has to suffer? And somebody must suffer, but we can easily recompense the five hundred farmers or so who may be hurt by the prohibition of the export of pulpwood. I would impress on the minister the urgent necessity of looking into the exportation of saw-logs from British Columbia. There, by adroit legislation, we have what amounts to an export tax on all timber cut in the country on privately-owned land, but if the wood is worked up in sawmills the tax is remitted. I think the tax runs to about $1.50 per thousand, but that is not sufficient to repay the national loss. We have many American companies operating in British Columbia, and I know one institution that

has spent over a million dollars on a logging railroad. Every log from that camp is sent across to the American side and our men are following the logs to work in the American mills.

How can we expect to succeed unless we take a bold step? Let us use our own coal and manufacture our own forest wealth, and see if we cannot set an example to the world of a country that does not have to tell its people: We cannot pay our way year by year.

Mr. LEGER: In my part of the country the people cut most of their wood in the month of June, and therefore if this prohibition of export went into effect at once it would mean a great loss to them. As they are dependent on the returns from their wood to pay their taxes and expenses, I trust the government will defer putting this proposed legislation into effect for this season, so that the people I have referred to may have sufficient time to become acquainted with the regulations and act in accordance therewith.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am entirely in accord with any effective steps that may be taken to preserve our timber supply,and I think something along the lines of this resolution is necessary as one of those effective steps. But I do not think it will get us very far alone, it must be part of a much more comprehensive policy. In the matter of principle I associate myself very earnestly with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie). Indeed, I believe that the law and the prophets is pretty much in his words. I am of course compelled to admit that his sentiments, while good horse business sense for this Dominion, are sadly out of harmony with those idealistic principles of free trade which we once heard so frequently from hon. gentlemen opposite, but which we now hear no more. I had some sympathy with the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) when he displayed an abhorrence of broken pledges and principles and showed that in its every feature this was a violation of those things for which his party was professing, and had in the past very emphatically professed, to stand, and which it yet proclaims as some beautiful ideal that it loves but is sorry that it cannot reach much sooner; all the while it is moving directly the other way. I know they have to fly in the face of every profession to pass this legislation. There is only this to be said: They must always do this if we are ever to get any sensible legislation. We must either do without the government or do without the sensible legislation. But my objection to this resolution is mainly another urged by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). It is not legislation at all. It does not even foreshadow legislation; it is simply a proclamation of the government to the House of inability to frame legislation. They say: We cannot bring any legislation before you; we cannot work it out; we have not any policy, but if you will give us the summer we will try to frame something, and we want authority now from the House to make it legislation. In other words, they say: We who almost destroyed our vocal organs for years denouncing order in council government come here and ask for power to pass any orders on earth respecting this new form of policy. Nor is this bill different from any other bill. The hon. member for Quebec South thought this perhaps the most audacious yet offered to get order in council powers, but it is not a particle worse than the last bill. In the worst days of the war—and war times are very different from peace times—powers of this kind were not asked for save on matters directly concerning the prosecution of the war.

Mr. POWER: What about the Grand Trunk?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the Grand Trunk, we came down with all the conditions, all the principles affecting the legislation.

Mr. POWER: By order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, in the bill. Look at the act. Look at the Canadian National Railway Act; look at the Grand Trunk Acquirement Act.

Mr. POWER: Was not the acquisition accomplished by order in council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not at all. Why, the Grand Trunk Pacific was laid at our door, pitched at us by the management. They wrote us a letter on the third of May and told us that on the tenth of May they would be out of business.

Mr. POWER: The right hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly I am right. In acquiring the Grand Trunk we asked parliament for all the powers and stated the terms upon which the road would be acquired. Had we proceeded as I will describe in a moment, we would have followed the course adopted here now. Had we brought in a resolution which read as follows: The Governor in Council may acquire the Grand Trunk railway upon such terms and conditions and at such price as may be fixed and according to such regula-

tions as may be passed by the Governor in Council,—that is the resolution we would have introduced had we followed the course this government is following in introducing this resolution; nor would it have been a bit more audacious. Look at the Grand Trunk Acquirement Act and compare it with this. There is nothing left to regulation except the merest detail. The whole principle of acquirement, the terms of acquirement—everything is there. That is what the government ought to have here. That is legislation; this is not legislation at all. It is merely a flouting of parliament, by those who were supposed to be rescuing the country from the evils of order in council government, by those who were going to bring back the days of control by legislation. What control is parliament going to have here? The government may do something or it may not. If it does anything, it may do it on whatever terms it likes. It may exempt whomever it likes; it may bring within the circle of the legislation whomever it likes. It may bring one province in and let another province out; there is nothing it may not do if legislation following this resolution passes. Again I say this is not foreshadowing legislation; it is merely asking for a blank cheque from the House of Commons that the government may pass what legislation it may deem wise or expedient for itself later on. It is to be expected that those who talk the loudest about the return to control by parliament are those who act the most defiantly in the very face of parliament when they are in power. I protest against that feature of the resolution and I ask the government to come down with a bill stating upon what terms they propose to prevent the exportation of pulpwood. If the terms are reasonable, I will support them. I am in favour of the principle. I know there are some who will be injured by it, but the individual interest, subject perhaps to proper compensation, must needs bow to the general good. I say I am in favour of the principle, but I ask for legislation. I do not like being asked day after day, sometimes half-a-dozen times a day, simply to sign a parliamentary cheque to an administration which hopes at some later time to be able actually to evolve a bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 242, to amend the Export Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BOARD OF AUDIT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide:

1. That the Governor in Council may appoint a Board of Audit to hold office until the first day of July, 1925, and to be composed of four members, one of whom shall be the Auditor General, one the Deputy Minister of Finance, and the remaining two members shall be public accountants of high standing;

2. That the public accountants, members of the said board, may be paid for their services such reasonable sums, not exceeding $3,000 each, in any one year as the Treasury Board may allow; and that the Treasury Board may allow the payment, out of any available appropriation, of necessary amounts for skilled assistants engaged by the Board;

3. That the said board shall have the following duties and powers:

(a) to inquire into and report upon the present system of audit of the public revenue and expenditure of Canada and to make recommendations for the more effective control of the same;

(b) to inquire into the systems of accounting employed by the Canadian National Railway Company and its constituent companies and any commission or other public body whose operations are carried on by appropriations from the treasury, and such other undertakings or services belonging to or receiving aid from the government of Canada as the Minister of Finance may direct, and to make recommendations with respect thereto;

4. That the members of the board shall for the purposes of these resolutions have the same power as is given to the Auditor General of Canada with respect to the various departments of the Dominion government.

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

On clause 1.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that in the absence of the Auditor General the Acting Auditor General would be on the board or would there be no representative from the Audit office?

Mr. FIELDING: I anticipate that the appointment of an Auditor General will be made very shortly and the real Auditor General will be the chairman.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 2.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not sure that we have been very generous in the allowance for this matter. The men to be appointed while they will not give their whole time it is true would have to be gentlemen of high professional standing, and I suggest that it is possible we may find it necessary at a later session to ask for some extension of this amount.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would suggest that my friend put it in now if he thinks it is necessary. We want to get results.

Mr. FIELDING: We could not change it without a special resolution, but I am glad to have the assent of my hon. friend. If we find it necessary we will feel free to enlarge the sum and come to parliament for a supplementary vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I am anxious for is that we should get real efficiency here. It is something much overdue, and I would like to help my friend in getting a really effective instrument.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think the failure to give a larger sum will prevent organization at the start, but I quite agree that we have not been too generous in the sum we have named.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 3.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me it would be better if they were to have the absolute right of inquiring into these systems, but I suppose the line as to the minister's direction is merely intended to apply to other undertakings or services belonging to or receiving aid from the government.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In other words they must inquire into the system of accounting by the Canadian National Railway Company and its constituent companies and any other commissions or public bodies for which we provide appropriations.

Mr. FIELDING: That is right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And if my hon. friend wants them to do anything else they are to do it.

Mr. FIELDING: Quite right.

Clause agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 243, to constitute a Board of Audit.

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

On section 4—Auditor General Chairman.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was going to ask the minister whether he thinks that should be put in the act or whether it should not be left to him? A great deal would depend, of course, on what he intends to do in connection with the office. I am perfectly free to confess in view of past performances that unless he is intending to bring in new blood I would hesitate to say that the Auditor General should be the chairman of the Board of Audit.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend may be satisfied that there will be nothing wrong in that respect. I am sorry to say that a slight amendment of a purely formal character which I intended to move seems to have been mislaid. I cannot find it among my papers, and I shall be glad to let the bill remain in committee for that purpose. It is of a purely formal character regarding moneys out of appropriations voted. After having passed the various clauses perhaps the chairman will be good enough to hold the bill in committee.

12 m.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend thinks it will be quite all right in connection with the chairmanship. I want to emphasize that we are really looking for changes and improvements and I do not think we could get them under the chairmanship of somebody whose experience is confined to that office as it now is.

Mr. FIELDING: While I have very great respect for the Acting Auditor General who has rendered most admirable service, still I think probably he is not at the time of life when it would be desirable to appoint him Auditor General. Frankly I do not contemplate his appointment. I desire to speak in the highest terms of his services and I may at a later stage request that he receive some recognition.

On section 16—Act not to impair authority of Auditor General.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The effect of section 16 is to make the board advisory?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps it is just as well to leave it that way, but it means that we get nothing done for this year.

Mr. FIELDING: They may report from time to time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is nothing that would give the minister the right to change the authority given by the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think any changes will be necessary which will require legislative authority. I should think they would be within our executive authority.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not contemplated they should only be employed for a certain time and then replaced by others?

Mr. FIELDING: No, this is a temporary organization and in a period of two years they should review the whole business, and advise such changes as may be necessary. They are not to audit any particular accounts but to review the audit system. It applies to the whole system generally, and I think it can be done in two years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the real underlying principle is that we want to have a real audit, rather than to have a mere audit of disbursements. We want a commercial audit of our business, something that will give effect to the pre-audit system, which is the audit system of all properly conducted establishments.

Mr. FIELDING: We want them to inquire into and report on the very things my hon. friend has mentioned.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on Bill No. 117 to amend the Insurance Act.

Mr. FIELDING: This bill was practically disposed of in committee, except that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) offered a suggestion by way of amendment which we thought we should consider. The matter has received consideration, the Superintendent of Insurance has conferred with the hon. member for St. John, and an amendment has been suggested in which I entirely concur, I now ask the committee to receive it.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment submitted by the hon. member for St. John appears on the last page of the bill. It will be section 6, and reads as follows:

> In any case where there has been imperfect compliance with a statutory condition as to the proof of law to be given by the insured, or as to any matter or thing to be done or omitted by the insured after the maturity of the contract, and a consequent forfeiture or avoidance of the insurance in whole or in part, and the court deems it inequitable that the insurance should be forfeited or avoided on that ground, the court may relieve against the forfeiture or avoidance on such term as it may deem just.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 7.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 7 will read as follows:

> No such company shall issue in Canada a valued policy of automobile insurance.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 84, an Act to amend The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK (Minister of Labour) moved:

> That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House disagrees to their amendments to Bill No. 84, an act to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, for reasons that the said amendments defeat the objects aimed at in the bill and would complicate rather than simplify procedure.

He said: This bill as originally introduced into the House of Commons had as its object the amendment of sections 15, 27 and 58. No new features were proposed, the amendments seeking simply to convey more clearly the intent of those sections as they had been generally understood; also in the case of section 58 a specific penalty was provided for an offence with regard to which in the statute as it had stood a penalty was implied but not stated. The principal amendment was that whereby in section 57 it is provided that where employer or workmen intend or desire to make a change in wages or hours "it shall be unlawful for the employer to make effective a proposed change in wages or hours or for the employees to go on strike until the dispute has been finally dealt with by a board and a copy of its report has been delivered through the registrar to both the parties affected." This proposed amendment in no way varies the intent of the clause but makes its meaning indisputable. In the amending bill this same section 57 is further amended by requiring that "the application for the appointment of a board shall be made by the employers or employees proposing the change in wages or hours." Whilst it has seemed clearly the intent of the statute that an application for the establishment of a board should proceed from the party proposing any such change as contemplated, yet this is not expressly stated, and, in the case of the several hundred boards which have been established in the past sixteen or seventeen years, the applications from the employers have been few in number, not, in fact, exceeding more than two or three per cent, a situation which has worked serious in-

justice to the workmen and has naturally aroused their resentment. Under the amendment proposed by the Minister of Labour when the employer proposed a change it would be his duty to make application for a conciliation board.

The amending bill passed the House of Commons without change. As the bill has been returned to this House, its object with respect to clarification of section 57 is entirely defeated, whilst an additional clause affecting the appointment of the chairman of a board has been added to the bill, which, if accepted, would tend seriously to delay and embarrass those administering the statute. The bill as it is now before parliament leaves section 57 without the clarifying additions proposed in the amending statute, but with a clause added which is quite inconsistent with and contrary in its effect to the main clause, for whereas clause 57 as it now stands provides quite clearly that a change with regard to wages and hours cannot be made effective until any dispute arising has been "dealt with by a board and a copy of its report has been delivered through the registrar to both the parties affected;" yet the proposed amendment of the upper House apparently seeks to have the proposed change effective as soon as the application for a board has been made.

The effect of this portion of the proposed addition to section 57 is therefore to render the whole section contradictory and confusing as between its different paragraphs. The remainder of the clause proposed as supplementary to section 57 adds to the confusion by introducing a reference to the retroactive character of the findings of a board. The reference in question does not actually add to the authority which a conciliation board has always been free to exercise, and, with regard to the declaration contained in the last sentence of the supplementary clause that "on the failure of either party to abide by the decision of the board, the other party may have recourse to a strike or lockout as the case may be," this also in no way increases or extends the rights or powers of the parties to a dispute beyond those which they would in any case possess under the statute. The amendment of the upper House with respect to section 57 would, therefore, have the effect of confusing, complicating and delaying procedure, without bringing compensating benefit of any kind.

The amendment proposed by the upper House with regard to section 8 respecting the appointment of a chairman introduces a new feature. The statute as it stands provides for the selection of a chairman by joint agreement when possible of the other two members of a conciliation board, and requires that, where no agreement is reached, the minister shall make the necessary appointment. In about one-half of several hundred boards which have been established a chairman has been secured by agreement. It had become a general though not invariable practice for the Minister of Labour, when called upon to appoint a chairman, to select a judge, but this practice ceased when two or three years ago the Judges' Act was so amended as to prohibit the acceptance by a judge of the fees ordinarily payable to a chairman or member of a conciliation board. It is true that the Minister of Labour is not under the Judges' Act, as it has been amended, prohibited from asking a judge to act as a chairman, nor is a judge apparently prohibited from accepting a chairmanship; but since fees are no longer payable in such circumstances to a judge, it has not been thought reasonable as a rule to request a judge to undertake the duties involved in a chairmanship; such duties, it will be understood, are frequently of a severe and arduous nature and in nearly all cases are of the highest moment to employers and to large numbers of workmen, as well as frequently to the public. In two cases since the amendment of the Judges' Act, judges have been, however, appointed, once by the Minister of Labour of the late administration and once by the present Minister of Labour, but in the latter case the appointment was made on the joint recommendation of the other board members. In both cases the judges concerned accepted from a sense of public duty; no fees were of course paid them. It may be said that there is every advantage in a chairman being secured by joint agreement and the Minister of Labour appoints a chairman with reluctance. Inquiry shows that this has been the case with most previous ministers. The chances of an agreement are manifestly increased when a chairman is secured by joint request of other board members. The method or system, however, under which different Ministers of Labour have made appointments has not been the subject of any known criticism, and certainly the files contain no communications requesting or suggesting a change in the present practice. The objections to the system laid down in the Senate amendment are obvious. In the first place, the appointment of a chairman by a chief justice, whether the Chief Justice of a province or of the Supreme Court of Canada, would entail inevitable delay. Such delays would be particularly unfortunate since,

despite every effort under present procedure, one side or other of the disputing parties is sometimes disposed to object to the time necessarily occupied in procedure. In the second place, a chief justice or other judge cannot possibly be as intimately seized of the nature of the dispute involved and of the particular type therefore of man wanted for the chairmanship as would be the Minister of Labour, who has established the board and has been in touch with details of procedure from its inception. It would be impossible to convey to a judge at a distant point by correspondence, which would of necessity be as a rule by telegraph with consequent expenditure and some danger of inaccuracy, all the particulars which should be properly at hand to enable the judge to reach a correct conclusion as to the type of person apparently best suited for the important duties involved. The judge would exercise his best judgment and the appointment might or might not prove to be a good one. In any case the minister who is charged with the administration of the statute would be freed from responsibility on this most vital aspect of administration and the judges would become involved in the technicalities of departmental procedure. Since a considerable proportion of the disputes dealt with under the statute extend to two or more provinces, the task of naming the chairman of conciliation boards would under the proposed Senate amendment fall most frequently to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who from the nature of his functions may be presumed to be furthest removed from contact with industrial disputes and necessarily therefore the more dependent on the advice of others as to the type of person best suited for a chairman. Despite the high legal and other attainments which a chief justice would undoubtedly possess, it is submitted that, in addition to the complication and delays in procedure which the proposed system of appointing chairmen would entail, the suggested change would be highly detrimental to the successful administration of the statute. I would, therefore, move that the amendments of the Senate be not concurred in.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I was not in at the moment the minister started. Would he tell the committee what he was reading from?

Mr. MURDOCK: A carefully prepared statement indicating the views on the amendments that have been made to Bill No. 84 since it left this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Indicating whose views?

Mr. MURDOCK: The reader's views.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to that. I did not know the minister was reading his speech. I thought he was fortifying his position from some real authority. In fact, I rather commend the intiative the minister has shown to-night in being very careful to read his speech.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the right hon. gentleman not consider the Minister of Labour a real authority on labour matters?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are certain things he is not a real authority on as I am compelled to admit reluctantly.

Mr. JACOBS: In the matter of labour legislation, the right hon. gentleman will admit that the Minister of Labour is a good authority.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As regards legislation he may be a very good workman, I have no doubt. If there is to be a difference between the Senate and the House of Commons in this matter I think I can offer a solution. In general I have no objection to the minister naming the third arbitrator in cases where it is essential that an outside party be named to act in that capacity. I think I may say it has been very general up to a certain time, as set out in the memorandum read by the minister and prepared by himself—well, I do not know that I can say that it was prepared by himself—that the person appointed was a judge. But as the memorandum states, since the time when by statute of this parliament, the judges were forbidden to accept outside remuneration, there has been some difficulty apparently in having judges act in such cases. I want to say very frankly that I do not think there should be any difficulty in having judges act in these matters, and in my opinion the statute should be amended so as to provide that the taking on of work of this kind shall be obligatory on the judge. I believe that the judges of this country to-day receive ample remuneration for the work they do, particularly the county court judges, who formerly did act under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. There are county court judges in this province who have not enough work to keep them—I almost said warm—at the present time, and why they should not be willing to serve the country by officiating as arbitrators under the Industrial Disputes Act I do not know. At the time the bill was passed which

prevented their taking extra remuneration for commission work, the judges' salaries were very substantially raised, and if they decline to act in such an appropriate capacity as that of arbitrator under the Industrial Disputes Act then, I ask, why does not the government bring in a measure to make this work a part of the duties of county court judges, or, for that matter, of other judges?

Mr. FIELDING: Can we define their duties?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course.

Mr. FIELDING: Are you sure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have done so.

Mr. FIELDING: The constitution of the courts is within provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The constitution of the courts is a matter of provincial jurisdiction, of course; but we can add to the duties of the judges. As a matter of fact we have done so. For example, we make the duties of judges obligatory under our Elections Act.

Mr. MARTELL: The constitution and procedure of the courts comes within the jurisdiction of the provinces. The only matter that appertains to federal authority is the appointment of the judges. Does not my hon. friend think that it would be ultra vires for the federal authority to impose extra burdens on any judge?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first proposition of my hon. friend is right, that the constitution and the procedure of the court are matters of provincial jurisdiction. But as to what a judge shall do is not a matter of procedure nor does it relate to the constitution of the court. Under our Dominion Elections Act and under our Controverted Elections Act, for instance, we assigned duties to judges.

Mr. BUREAU: Within the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, within the province. And we assign duties to the judges under the Criminal Code. In fact, there are statutes galore of this House assigning duties to judges.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend is a clever lawyer. We should like him to explain that point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I was explaining it. I say that in our Criminal Code we assign duties to the judges.

Mr. MARTELL: The Criminal Code is federal in its constitution.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, and so is this a matter of federal jurisdiction or we should not be passing it.

Mr. MARTELL: Does that assign duties to judges?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The regular judges are assigned duties under these various federal statutes, for the purposes designated, and this has been the practice for a great many years. It is immaterial whether or not they are assigned the duties in their function as judges; so long as they are assigned those duties it becomes obligatory on the judges to perform them; and why they should not perform these particular duties, which are pre-eminently of a judicial character, I cannot see. They are the proper persons to perform those duties. If the judges are made eligible I do not object to the minister being given the power to name the third arbitrator. I apprehend that what those who object to the bill in the form in which it passed this House have in mind is that the minister, not being able to appoint judges, will appoint some person whom he wishes to favour or who in his opinion will give a judgment suitable to himself. It is that fear that has no doubt animated the amendments, and we could remove it by making it compulsory on judges to accept this work. I cannot speak for the other House, of course, but it seems to me that it might well be agreed that if this work is made the compulsory duty of judges, the objections which the Senate entertained to the bill as it passed the House of Commons would be removed.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not my hon. friend think it would be advisable in the case of any dispute in a province to let the Governor in Council of the province name the arbitrator, seeing that they would be more familiar with the conditions?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like the principle of this House passing legislation to enable another government to appoint anyone.

Mr. MARTELL: I was not suggesting that; I was merely asking my hon. friend for his opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, my opinion is in the negative, and I will argue the matter more in detail when a bill of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) comes up. To my mind the right thing to do is to assign these duties to the judges. That done, it seems to me that the basic objection to the legislation would be removed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I gather from what my right hon. friend says that he assumes that the Senate had in mind in its recommendation that the minister might make a partisan appointment or appoint someone for personal reasons. I think my hon. friend is mistaken in any view that the minister has done anything of the kind, or that the records of the past will show any such thing. If one looks over the list of those appointed as chairmen of boards of arbitration, one will be struck with the circumstance that for the most part the chairmen have been remarkably free from partisan bias.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would not apply to Alex. Smith.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Alex. Smith is an able lawyer and his part as arbitrator went to show that his selection was a remarkably good one. We can only judge of the worth of appointees by the nature of the service they render, and my hon. friend will find that the chairmen of practically all boards have really given remarkable satisfaction in the generality of cases so far as the discharge of their duties is concerned. It is not for us, I think, to assume what the motives were, but one realizes that in the other Chamber they are inclined to look to the courts for many matters to which we in this House would look to ministers responsible to the House and through the House to the public; and it would be a mistake to get away from that responsibility which ministers of the Crown have to parliament for appointments that are made. There is a large field to draw from apart from the courts. There are many business men of wide experience such, for example, as college professors, and men of the legal and other professions, and there is a very large body of public-spirited persons who take interest in social and economic questions. That whole field is open from which to select chairmen for boards of arbitration. I agree with my right hon. friend that the judges have in many cases made excellent chairmen. In the case of county court judges I think it ought to be made possible to have them selected in any event as chairmen of boards of arbitration; but I certainly would be strongly opposed to giving to the chief justice of a province the naming of the third arbitrator. I think the appointment should remain where it is at present, in the hands of the minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion speaks again he will close the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He simply read a memorandum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. minister, I understand, takes a different position to that taken by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. If any other hon. member desires to speak on the motion he should do so now before the debate is closed.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I heartily concur in the remarks made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), and submit that the amendments made by the Senate ought not to be accepted. The right hon. leader of the Opposition stated that in some provinces county court judges should act as third arbitrators.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say in some provinces, I said everywhere.

Mr. JACOBS: In the province of Quebec we have no county court judge system; our judiciary are either judges of the superior court or of the circuit court. From my province frequent demands are made on the Department of Justice and the government for the appointment of new judges, our present judges not being able to cope with the work. But the question before the House is whether a judge of the Supreme Court—or as with us in the province of Quebec, a judge of the superior court—should have the appointment of third arbitrator after one has been named by each of the contending parties. I submit that this has a tendency to drag the whole judicial system more or less into the political arena. When we have strife between employers and employees there is always a good deal of tension, and it seems to me that is just the time when the Minister of Labour, a responsible member of the government, should appoint the third arbitrator.

I look with certain misgivings upon the Senate interfering in labour matters to the extent they have done in this particular case. The Senate, as we know, cannot deal with money matters, these being peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Commons. Now, it seems to me that labour matters are something in which labour is particularly concerned, and consequently I think that an irresponsible body like the Senate ought to have enough wisdom to refrain from interfering.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member tell us what the Senate should deal with?

Mr. JACOBS: I submit that they ought to be a kind of rubber stamp to concur in the legislation sent up by the Commons in labour matters.

Mr. BUREAU: Order.

Mr. JACOBS: I am not speaking generally, but I think labour matters ought to be peculiarly for the Commons alone to deal with and not an irresponsible body like the Senate. The Minister of Labour in the past has been making these appointments, and there has been no complaint whatever. If any appointment does not meet with the approval of the people, the minister is responsible and, indirectly, the government of which he is a member. Surely that ought to be satisfactory to this House and to the Senate, and I must protest most vigorously against the Senate interfering in labour legislation affecting, as it does, the people.

We have under our constitution three divisions of government—the legislative, the judicial and the administrative. Now, our judges pass upon cases submitted to them, they address juries, they sift evidence, and they give their judgment in accordance with the facts. But when you have a judge mixed up in disputes between capital and labour, where the decision is bound to react upon the judiciary, I say—

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend as a lawyer of many years' standing must know that the law is for the judge while the facts are always for the jury to find.

Mr. JACOBS: I think we can pass that remark off with a laugh. It does not deserve anything better.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend does not know the difference.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman probably wished to sidetrack me, and to that extent I think he has succeeded. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am most vigorously opposed to the amendments to this legislation, and would suggest that they be sent back in order that that august body may have another opportunity of pondering the legislation and passing it in the form in which it was first sent up by this House.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): I am not rising for the purpose of absolutely contradicting my friend, but I have every respect for the gentlemen who constitute the upper Chamber and deprecate their being reflected upon in any way. There was a time in my short life when I was wont to oppose the second Chamber, but my experience as law clerk in the legislative council of Nova Scotia has led me to believe that an upper chamber is absolutely essential. It is the good old English system and I think it is good enough for Canada. All I ask in regard to this particular piece of legislation is this: I am thoroughly in accord with the principle that the judges should have the right to deal with all things that come before them, and if it is necessary to appoint a judge to act as arbitrator in a particular matter, the minister should have that right. The minister should retain the right to appoint an arbitrator where there is a difference of opinion between the employer and employee. The Senate has said that in such cases the tasks should be undertaken by the chief justice in the province concerned. In many cases the chief justice does not know the facts of the case. The minister has an opportunity of knowing all the circumstances. He gets the representations of the employees as well as of the employer, and he is in a position to name a man who should act. I believe that the judges should not have to deal with any controversial matter which may be of political significance. They are appointed to administer justice as between plaintiff and defendant in a civil matter and as between the King and his subjects in a criminal matter, and they should not be called upon to adjudicate in anything of a controversial character. I repeat that the upper chamber is what may be called a sober second thought in the matter of legislation and when they undertake to relieve the adjudicators of this land from dealing with matters which may be of a controversial political character, they are doing the right thing.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): I do not wish to make any extended remarks on this amendment, but I desire to oppose it, not merely because the Senate has offered the amendment, or because I think the judges are opposed to labour when they act as arbitrators in matters of labour disputes, but because I think the Labour department, as representing at least to some extent the voters of the country, is surely in a better position to act in this matter than the judges would be. The bill as drawn meets with the approval of organized labour; therefore I oppose the amendment made in this regard and hope the bill will be sent back to the Senate as originally drafted.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Speaker, just one word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I may inform hon. members that when the Minister of Labour speaks he will close the debate.

Mr. MURDOCK: The department would be glad indeed if it were possible to utilize the services of judges as heretofore. I was rather surprised to hear my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition suggest that we might go back to that desirable system, because it was in 1921 when he led the government that provision was made under which it became impossible thereafter to utilize the services of judges in such cases. We have found that judges are like other working men, like ordinary labourers—no pay, no overtime. In other words, with their regular duties and responsibilities before them and a specific salary for the performance of those duties, they are not willing—and I am not criticising them—to take on additional responsibilities without the additional compensation that is given to a private person who undertakes such extra work. But the amendments made by the upper House to section 57 are the most important, because their effect would be to make section 57 confused and complicated and to delay the procedure connected with the handling of boards of investigation, to say nothing of delay in getting results under the provisions of the act.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—PRIVILEGE, Mr. MARTELL

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I wish to rise to a question of privilege. It has been stated in the daily press that a unanimous report has been presented from the Civil Service Committee. I want to say that I never signed that report. So far as the Civil Service of Canada is concerned I am in favour of going back to the Civil Service Act as from 1908.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 12.48 a.m. (Tuesday).

Tuesday, June 26, 1923.

The House met at eleven o'clock.

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) moved concurrence of the House in the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh reports of the committee charged with the investigation into agricultural conditions in Canada.

He said: I would just like to ask the House to grant me permission to postpone any remarks I have to offer until I see whether the reports are open to criticism. I take it that informally moving the concurrence of the House in these reports I do not exhaust my right to speak.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not know what the object would be of the House adopting now four reports just recently presented, certainly ill-digested, so far as the House is concerned, if digested or read at all. If legislation is contemplated this session, then there would be some object in a discussion now of the merits of the reports. But if no legislation is in view—and we had the intimation yesterday there was not—it seems to me that we are not using very well the short time that remains in discussing these four reports. I do not make these remarks in any spirit of antagonism to the reports, because I am frank to admit I am doubtful whether I have read them all. I know I have read a good deal of them; but I venture to say that a great number, if not the vast majority in this House, have not read any part of them. I would think it would be better to defer consideration of them, until we were in a position to legislate, if legislation was thought desirable. We are not in such a position now.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister, for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee of the whole to-morrow to consider a certain proposed resolution concerning advances to the Corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT, 1915, AMENDMENT BILL

On the Notice of Motion:

The Minister of Finance—In Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 230 entitled "An Act to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915," the Minister of Finance will move:—

That in section one of this Bill there be inserted after clause (iii) of subsection two the following:—

"and every adhesive stamp affixed to such cheque shall be cancelled by the bank at which the cheque is payable at or before the time of payment."

And he will move:—

That in section six of said Bill, the third paragraph of subsection one of section nineteen BBB be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

"Provided that the consumption or sales tax specified in this section shall not be payable on goods exported; or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale and which are articles subject to the consumption or sales tax, or on goods imported by a licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale and which are articles subject to the consumption or sales tax; or on goods imported by a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for under the provisions of subsection (7); or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for under the provisions of subsection seven of this section."

Mr. FIELDING: This is a motion for consideration in committee. It does not call for action at this moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the usual notice been given of a motion to go into committee on this resolution?

Mr. FIELDING: It will be considered in Committee of Ways and Means. This is a proposed amendment that could be moved in Committee of Ways and Means without notice, but I thought it better to put it on the Order Paper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It should be moved in committee on the bill.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my right hon. friend is right. It will be taken up in committee after the second reading of the bill, and not in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be pretty hard to keep up with all these amendments to the budget.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We shall have to take some schooling in arithmetic.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend will recollect that at an earlier stage he asked me how many amendments there would be, and I said as many as were found necessary to make things right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no budget to which so many amendments have been necessary as the budget of the present Minister of Finance. It seems to be a matter of continuous amendment throughout the session.

Mr. FIELDING: Every budget which has to deal with such a variety of things will be open to the same comment

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has been the same variety of things covered by budgets for the last twenty years.

Notice of motion stands.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

House again in Committee on Bill No. 222, to amend the Dominion Lands Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Transfer of holders of letters patent in pre-emption and purchased homestead area to another homestead, by provincial certificate.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At the request of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), this clause stood, and I did not make any explanation at the time in connection with it. The explanation is that for some considerable time, the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have made representations asking that individuals who have homesteaded in the southern areas known as the drier areas of those provinces be given the privilege of securing a second homestead if they were desirous of doing so, in the northern area of the particular province, where more fertile lands were available. To meet this, we have embodied in this clause a provision that where an individual has had a homestead and has made failure owing to no fault of his own, but rather to climatic conditions that exist in those areas, he be given an opportunity to take a homestead in the northern area of the province under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act. It is necessary that he be armed with the certificate from the provincial government showing that in their opinion he is entitled to consideration. We have confined this matter to the area south of township 31, not including all the district formerly known as the pre-emption area across the two provinces. That is all we propose to do in the matter. I may assure the committee that we propose to make a careful inquiry to make sure that we are not being imposed upon, and to confine our operations absolutely to those who have been unsuccessful in this particular area.

Mr. KELLNER: How does the minister intend to dispose of the lands that are being vacated?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the land owned by the individual is unencumbered it will revert to the Crown. This section is designed to cover the case of the individual who has failed in due course and loses the land he homesteaded within the boundary described in this section.

Mr. CALDWELL: If the original homestead is mortgaged does the government propose to assume the obligations in respect of that land?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. CALDWELL: How is it intended to meet such a situation? If the land reverts to the government, I presume from the minister's answer, it will be unencumbered, but what about the homestead on which there is a mortgage?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no difficulty in relation to the man whose title is clear; but the government will certainly not assume the obligations on encumbered property.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should hope not.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is rather for the purpose of assisting the individual who has failed and who has to surrender his homestead. If a man loses his homestead by mortgage or otherwise, we do not assume the responsibility for those obligations, but we assist him to settle in the northern portion of the province rather than have him go out of the country altogether, as unfortunately too many do. A large number of men in such circumstances go South, and this is intended to retain them in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I certainly favour the working out of a plan for granting second homesteads or, in other words, giving a second opportunity to those who are in the dry areas. The opening up of these dry areas was one among other mistakes of the former government —I mean the next antecedent one in which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was then in the same office. The lands were opened up for homesteading when they should not have been, and they have been a source of disappointment and penury ever since. I realize the minister's difficulty in now trying to find some remedy for the consequences of that mistake, but while I fully appreciate that difficulty I do not think he has met it very well. The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) mentioned a point which, in my judgment, is not as important as another one that I shall suggest later on. Still it has not been answered. Suppose a man has his homestead in the dry area and it is mortgaged—this can be taken to be the normal condition, for I fancy that if the homestead were not mortgaged that would indicate that the party could not get a mortgage on it; such has been the history of the district, the man would be compelled to mortgage the property if he could—we assume, therefore, that the homestead is mortgaged. This, of course, puts a premium on the individual's leaving and going North. The Government does not get his homestead; it certainly cannot step in and defeat the mortgagee of whatever asset he has in the homestead, little as it may be. Consequently the land will simply be foreclosed and become the property of the mortgagee. The difference between the man who has his land clear and the man who has not such a title to it is that in the one case the government gets the land and in the other the mortgagee gets it. I presume the minister intends to let the fellow with the mortgage have a second homestead, because if he does not then the legislation might as well be wiped out; for I should think that nearly all the homesteads would be mortgaged, and those who have mortgaged and failed are those who need the second homestead. The minister has not said whether he purposes to let those whose land is mortgaged get a second homestead. If he does he is putting the country in the position of losing the first homestead altogether and turning it over to the mortgagee.

The second point is this. It is stated that any one can get a second homestead who has a certificate from the provincial government showing that he has failed at farming through no fault of his own but through adverse circumstances. But the minister has his officers all through the districts; he has homestead inspectors—and I can remember some of the criticism that was offered in regard to the number of them when the vote to pay them was passed. Why should they not report on the condition and history of these homesteads? Why should the provincial government be asked to give any certificate? The provincial government will simply have to appoint another set of officers, putting additional taxation on the people; no other result can follow. They will be obliged to have another set of homestead inspectors to examine all these cases and that means a squadron of them. But even aside from the question of expense to the public, which will be very considerable, it is not right for one government to rest on the responsibility of another, it is not consistent with our system of government at all. This government should use its own judgment on the advice of its officers in this matter as in anything of a similar nature. I suggest to the minister, therefore, that he wipe out that provision. I would rather see something done that removes the question of discretion altogether; in fact I think that otherwise the minister will get into interminable wrangles and utterly ines-

capable conditions of unfairness and partiality. He cannot help it. Throughout the length and breadth of the country farmers can be selected in hundreds, yes, thousands, who have failed, not through any fault of their own at all, and not in this particular area. Farmers all over Canada have failed because of continual visitations of drought, continual visitations of hail and frost and one misfortune or another; and what answer can the minister give those men who come and say that they are just as entitled to relief as the farmers over there to the west? They will say, "You give relief to these men on this especial ground; very well, apply it to us in the same way." And what answer can the minister give? I have not the least doubt, although none of this area is in the province of Manitoba, that the Manitoba government could certify to hundreds and thousands who have failed through no fault of their own, who perhaps succeeded for a time and now are worth nothing. How can the minister refuse them new homesteads? On these grounds I do not think the minister's relief is an efficient working out of the problem. In my judgment it would have been better to have simply declared certain areas to be homestead areas and then said to those men: Select new homesteads there. In this case, I am free to admit, there would be some unfairness to those outside.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You would have exactly the same difficulty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, because those are areas that never should have been opened. And you do not rest upon the favour of a provincial government, you rest simply upon the cold, bald fact that areas were opened that should not have been opened, and you say to the men who went in there "Go and take homesteads somewhere else." Let me repeat; I object to a government shifting its responsibility on to another government. Let it take its own responsibility. But I am free to admit that if ever a government should shift responsibility it is this one.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The debate so far has brought up a question which I imagine will be discussed on the adoption of the report of the Agricultural Conditions committee—the creation of a national land bank for the relief of the farmers of the West. If that is so, there will have to be some discussion later on in regard to it, and perhaps the Government will announce a policy which, besides allowing farmers to re-homestead, will give them a measure of relief such as the farmers have in the United States, through a national bank credit system with the credit of the nation behind it. So this is only a partial measure. It must go further, it must be supplemented by giving the farmer a better system of credit. This bill really ignores the main issue, which is a land bank system similar to what they have adopted in the United States to enable the farmer to get on his feet financially. We ought to have such a system in this country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Chairman, I would remind my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) that this is not a question of banking.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): It is.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg my hon. friend's pardon, it is a question of giving relief to certain areas, whereas the question of banking would cover the whole Dominion.

My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) states that there are certain well defined areas on which we should offer individuals another choice of a free homestead to give them a fresh start. There is absolutely not a particle of difference in the proposal embodied in this section and what he suggested a moment ago in criticism of this bill. We are told that mistakes were made by former governments. Well, I do not know whether we should criticise former governments for what they have done in this respect. I know I have had a good deal of anxiety in regard to the southern area of Alberta and that in all efforts to alleviate the distress of the people in that territory the two governments have worked hand in hand. It is not suggested that we should put upon the provincial government the responsibility of saying who shall and who shall not have homesteads, but inasmuch as the western provinces are claiming their natural resources, we thought it only right that if any individual was to be given a homestead the provincial government should be informed of the fact. It is for this reason that the provincial government is being brought into the matter at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the reason?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In every effort that has been made for the alleviation of distress in these areas the two governments have acted together, practically.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg my right hon. friend's pardon. As an instance, take the distribution of seed grain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The two governments have co-operated, I do not object to that; but the Dominion government never acted on the responsibility of the provincial government. The Dominion government, for example, did not give seed grain relief to a man recommended for it by the provincial government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg my right hon. friend's pardon, they did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They did it in Alberta. The practice has been followed for the last six years. Not only that, but relief has been distributed by the provincial officers to the homesteaders.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be, but the provincial government does it on its own responsibility. We did not make a condition that the man should be recommended by the provincial government, we took the responsibility ourselves.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is the result of what you did do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it is not. I think I ought to know.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For instance, by whose authority did you advance seed grain to a homesteader? True, the provincial government were advancing it to those with unpatented land, but you took the word of the provincial officer, you advanced the amount of grain, your own officer purchased the grain and put it in your elevators. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. If the minister looks at the law he will see he is mistaken. I administered the act and know what was done. We decided on our own responsibility whether an unpatented homesteader needed seed grain or not, we did not rely upon the recommendation of the provincial government. We made arrangements by passing legislation providing that the banks should advance the money in the first place and we guaranteed five per cent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So did the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. That shows we did not collect it through the province.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Every application passed through the hands of the provincial authorities. I am speaking of the practice in recent years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not the practice under me.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But that is aside from the question. By this clause it is simply intended that the provincial government shall be consulted and that we shall accept their certificate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But you cannot grant a homestead without their certificate.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are anxious to have their co-operation to clean up a very difficult situation. I admit everything my right hon. friend has said about the difficulty. It would be very much easier for the government not to do anything at all—and perhaps it would be fairer taking all things into consideration. The very fact that a person who has selected land in this particular territory has made a failure—I admit my right hon. friend's argument—is not a good reason why he should be given a preference over the man who has tried in some other territory and has made a like failure. But we have a difficult situation to deal with. I am not unmindful of the difficulties at all, I see every one of those presented by my right hon. friend, but rather than have the people across the line we thought it well to devise ways and means to enable them to make a fresh start in the northern portion of the province if they were desirous of going there. And if any individual is to be given a privilege, it seems only reasonable that the provincial authorities should at least be consulted in the matter.

Not that they are to step in and shoulder any of our responsibility. We are not delegating any of our responsibility to the provincial government. My own idea with respect to the settlement of this vexed question would be if possible to move the settlers off these very dry areas and return these areas again to ranching lands. In doing that, of course, regard must be had to obligations that are already upon the lands—mortgage obligations, school bonds, and so on. I am speaking now of lands which cannot be irrigated. There is a demand that the department try to solve the problem and we are prepared to make an effort. I do not anticipate that a very large number of people will take advantage of the legislation. For instance, a man who has a mortgage on his land is not going to relinquish that land unless he thinks there is no chance of his making good. It is my experience, after eight years of intimate knowledge of the conditions affecting the people who live in these localities, that they invari-

ably stay until they have to leave—and their leaving means that there is no equity left in the property at all.

Mr. MILLAR: I am very glad indeed that the minister has undertaken to solve this very difficult problem; it has been a nightmare to banks, merchants and provincial and federal governments for some time. Undoubtedly there are areas that should never have been taken from the rancher—good ranching districts that were destroyed to make a very poor farming district. In 1914 I had occasion to travel over some five hundred miles of this dry area for the purpose of gathering some information and looking into the facts. You will remember that 1914 was a very dry season, but some of the farmers in that district had good crops. I inquired why it was that one farmer had a good crop while perhaps fifty or one hundred round about had nothing, and I found that the men on the farms that had given a good return had been doing their work in a scientific way and had conserved all the moisture that was humanly possible to conserve. Now, it might appear from that experience that the difference was simply a case of good farming as against poor farming, but I believe that is not so. The year 1914 followed several comparatively wet years, and there was some moisture to conserve. Subsequently there were a number of dry years—up to two years ago we had had four or five dry years—with the result that there was no moisture to conserve; the subsoil was as dry as powder. That leads me to believe that in these dry areas, no matter how well the soil is farmed, it is impossible to attain success. A great many of the people who settled in those districts came in with considerable amount of money; their buildings are comparatively new and in many instances are better buildings than those we find in the older areas. For that reason I think it is well that opportunity should be given to those who wish to do so to move to areas where they can succeed.

With a part of what the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) said I must agree, namely, that it would be wiser to base any action taken on the conditions affecting each individual farmer in the area in which he resides. If it is simply a case of the farmer failing through no fault of his own, why, you would have applications made from all over the country. But the difference is this: Many farmers are living on land where, if the economic conditions were made right, they could succeed. They are living on land that can be profitably worked and which can reasonably be expected in the future to yield a fair return. On the other hand, those who live in these arid districts are on land where no farmer, be he ever so good, could possibly succeed. In 1915 the crop in these arid districts was an enormous one, perhaps the greatest that western Canada ever saw—fifty, and even sixty bushels to the acre being not uncommon. The extent of the crop was almost unbelievable. And perhaps that was one of the worst things that could have happened to some of the farmers there, because it gave them hope; they believed they could go to almost any extent in their schemes of expansion, and they hung on year after year for three or four or five years. If another good crop comes, the same thing will happen again, but any temporary measure of success in a given year simply prolongs the agony. It does seem to me that farmers living in these arid districts where it will always be impossible for them to succeed should be entitled to a new homestead, if they take it within a specified time. Of course, the door should not be left open, after this regulation is passed, to those living in other parts of the country to move to another homestead after they have tried one in the arid district for say six months. It should apply, however, to those who settled in these arid districts in good faith. The minister has said he does not think that very many are likely to take advantage of this opportunity. Well, the reason for that is not that the chances of success under their present conditions are good, but simply that they have invested their all. To my mind they would be well advised to take advantage of this opportunity and accept new homesteads.

Mr. KELLNER: I hestitate to criticise this legislation, because I suppose it applies to all the prairie provinces, but I doubt whether it is going to be very beneficial to the province with which I am best acquainted, Alberta. It seems to me that this is the way it will work out: Four or five of these homesteaders will go up in the north part of the province and get a desirable piece of land; then they will get after the provincial government for schools and after the municipality for roads, and neither of these organizations will be prepared to accede to their requests. I do not think there is any need for the adoption of this course. I am quite convinced that these people could go up to that north country and either buy or rent land much cheaper than they could get a homestead to-day. The legislation may be all right theoretically, but I very much doubt whether

it will work out when an attempt is made to put it into practice. I would also point out to the minister that the day cannot be much longer delayed when he will have to give consideration to the demand for the return to the western provinces of their natural resources. Every acre that the government disposes of will simply add to the barrier existing between the Dominion government and the provinces when that day of reckoning comes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the minister will tell us how close that "day of reckoning" is that the hon. member refers to.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as the minister is concerned it might happen to-morrow. I am not, however, speaking for the government in that regard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just as likely to happen to-morrow as it was eighteen months ago.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOARD OF AUDIT

House again in committee on Bill No. 243, to constitute a Board of Audit.

Mr. FIELDING: When this bill was about to be reported last evening I mentioned that there was a small amendment of a purely formal character which I was unable to find at the moment. It is simply this: I move to add as paragraph 17 the following:—

Any expenditure necessary to carry out the provisions of this act shall be made out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

That is the usual course.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GOOD: There are no copies of the bill distributed as yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the bill must be found on the files. It has been printed for several days. The bill is simply a transcript of the resolution which was on the order paper for some days.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTIES ON MANILA FIBRE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 188, to repeal the acts respecting bounties on manufactures from manila fibre in Canada.

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

On section 1—Bounties on binder twine and cordage repealed.

Mr. GOOD: Would the minister state briefly the purpose and effect of this legislation?

Mr. FIELDING: The Act which it is proposed to repeal was passed some years ago, arising out of a then existing condition in relation to the export of manila fibre from the Philippine Islands. At that time an advantage was given to the United States and for compensation this bounty act was then passed. In later years the condition has entirely changed and no bounty has been paid for some years. It is practically a dead issue, but we thought it better to have the act repealed.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTIES ON COPPER BARS OR RODS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 189 respecting the payment of bounties on copper bars or rods.

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

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. FIELDING: This matter was very fully considered when the resolution was before the House and I do not think any further explanation is required at this stage.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Limitation.

Mr. McMASTER: I beg in connection with clause 3 to move an amendment by adding a clause 3A. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to prepare a copy for the Minister of Finance, but I will send over my original to him forthwith.

I am utterly opposed to this bounty business. I think it is eminently unsound. I think the business men who want to start business in this country, if they have got a meritorious proposition should reap the benefits and run the risks. In this case we encourage people to ask the state to help. The state runs the risk while others receive all the benefits. That being the case I move:

That the following paragraph be added to paragraph 3 to be known as paragraph 3A:

3A. Any amount so paid out shall be considered as advances by way of loan to those receiving the same and shall be repayable to the Crown as follows: One-fifth of the amount received on the 1st

day of July, 1930; one-fifth on the 1st day of July, 1931; one-fifth on the 1st day of July, 1932; one-fifth on the 1st day of July, 1933; one-fifth on the 1st day of July, 1934; with interest on any overdue instalment at the rate of six per cent per annum. Any failure to pay any instalment when the same falls due shall cause subsequent instalments at the option of the Governor in Council to become due.

Now, if there is any merit in the bounty system the amendment gives to these people who want to make copper bars an opportunity of using the public money without interest for some considerable time, but the interest of the public will be protected to this extent: If the proposal works out well and the company that receives this bounty continues in existence, one of the first charges upon it will be the repayment to the people of the amount advanced by the state. We have seen, in connection with the bounties that were paid on iron and steel in Nova Scotia, the company re-organized from time to time on fictitious capital, and we have seen them from time to time paying dividends on that fictitious capital, thus capitalizing again the benefits that the people gave them. I wish, if possible, to avoid such an eventuality, and, therefore, I humbly and respectfully submit this resolution for the approval of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: One of the rules of the House is that an amendment must be relevant. I submit that this amendment does not come within that rule. The House has already resolved that certain bounties, certain grants of money, shall be made under the conditions specified. The hon. gentleman's amendment entirely negatives that proposition. The amendment proposes that the grant be converted into a loan. I submit, therefore, that it is not relevant and is not in order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I have any special interest in the amendment, but I have in the rules of the House. I take very direct exception to the appeal of the Minister of Finance. I cannot conceive of anything that is more relevant than the present amendment. The House has resolved that aid be given, that grants be made, to this industry, but that does not in the least restrict the power of the committee to amend the bill pursuant thereto. If that be so, what is the use of having first a resolution and then a bill—why not just have the one? Both are subject to amendment. The grant is made but the amendment makes it subject to return, that is all.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, no.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: For my part I cannot see that there is any objection to it so far as the rules are concerned. When it comes to the merits of the resolution I will have something else to say.

Mr. FIELDING: I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with my right hon. friend. I say the amendment must be relevant. The House has already decided that it is going to make these grants—as gifts if you like to make use of that term. Whether it is wise or not is another question. The House has decided it will grant these bounties by way of gift and my hon. friend has moved that it be converted into a loan. I submit the amendment is not relevant. I do not think the right exists to make any such amendment to any measure of this kind. The amendment must be subject to the rule of relevancy, and my impression is that it is not relevant to the bill at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister is wrong in his statement as to the amendment not being relevant. I cannot really see a ground for argument even. The minister argues that the House has decided to make this grant. What the House has done has been to resolve that it is expedient to bring in a bill. That is all the House has done and here is the bill. The amendment is as relevant as anything can be.

Mr. FIELDING: The bill is for the purpose of granting bounties. The amendment proposes that the bounties be converted into loans. That is entirely negative of the purpose which the House has already resolved.

Mr. McMASTER: May I submit this, speaking to the point of order: If instead of moving this amendment I had moved that the bounties be reduced to a point where they would have been merely equivalent to the value of the use of the money for the time this company will have it, would that have been held out of order? I hardly think so.

Mr. FIELDING: I would say that a motion to reduce the bounties would be entirely within the rule of the House as to relevancy, and would be in order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The argument would apply just the same.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House has resolved to introduce a bill to grant bounties of a

certain amount. That is all the House has done. Here is the bill, we can amend it just as we like.

Mr. POWER: I submit that the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from Brome amounts to a reduction of the bounty. He proposes that there should be no interest paid for five years. Therefore there is a gift of the interest for that period, and the amendment only proposes a reduction of the bounty.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the well-known rule is that in committee a very wide discretion in the matter of amendments is allowed, in fact each clause of a bill or resolution may be negatived by a vote. While the amendment varies the nature of the grant and makes it rather a loan than a bounty, I feel that it is in order and may be considered.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member for Brome alluded to the bounties on iron and steel. He said that the company concerned had seen fit to make certain issues of capital, to declare certain dividends and so forth. All of this is probably correct. Whether or not it is wise to grant bounties is a debatable question; nevertheless in my judgment, but for those bounties there would have been no steel industry in Cape Breton.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to ask whether the copper rods upon which this bounty is to be given are to be made from copper produced in the nickel mines of Canada, say at Sudbury?

Mr. FIELDING: They are to be made from copper mined in Canada, that is all I can say.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to point out that in the current Blackwood's Magazine, a leading Conservative organ in Great Britain, this month there is an article which states that the fact that immense quantities of copper, which were more or less controlled by British firms, got to Germany during the war was a scandal. Among the things which went to Germany throughout the war was the product of the nickel mines of Canada. I happened to draw attention to that fact some years ago, but nothing was done. Now is the time to correct that mistake in connection with the copper mines of Sudbury. There is something else worth pointing out: The people of Canada are entitled to know the content of precious metals in these ores such as platinum, palladium, iridium, and so forth. The companies that will get the benefit of this bounty may be producing these ores, but notwithstanding the fact that the Ontario and Federal governments, and the public, have asked to know the content of precious metals they are still in the dark on the subject. I insist on the government refusing to give a bounty now to any copper mines in this country unless the owners disclose the actual content of precious metals in their ores. This matter has been an outstanding scandal as far as Canada is concerned, and in saying this I am only repeating what I have said heretofore, namely, that people outside of this country or our own companies who refine that copper ore or nickel ore have never yet disclosed the content of precious metals, including platinum, in that ore. Surely we are entitled to have that information.

12 noon.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the clause which he is discussing at the present time refers strictly to payment or non-payment of bounties.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And I say that there should be no payment to any company which refuses to disclose the precious metal content in the ore. That is the scandal of the war that has not been disclosed yet. As a matter of fact, Germany had an unlimited supply of Canadian copper, nickel, platinum and several other metals, and the country never knew that Germany was getting it.

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the revival of the bounty system. The people of this country are overtaxed already. We have a precedent in the steel industry to which we granted bounties in former years. The Minister of Finance declares that we would have had no steel industry but for the bounty. I think he is entirely mistaken; I can well remember the time when we were granting, I think, $7 a ton bounty on steel rails that were used in this country, and the Nova Scotia Steel Company at that time was cutting prices against the whole world on steel rails. While we, with a bounty added, were paying $39 a ton for steel rails which we used on the Transcontinental, similar rails were being delivered in the southern Punjab at $24 a ton. I maintain that the steel industry did not need that bounty; I maintain that the copper industry will not need this bounty, and until any company can show us the need for a bounty of this kind, I shall strenuously oppose it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member (Mr. Evans), and I think the minister should show to the committee, first of all, that unless something is done, there will not be the industry, and that what he proposes has a reasonable

chance of producing the industry and the extent of it, so that hon. members will know whether the country is going to get any benefit therefrom. Of course he will say that if there is no industry, there will be no bounty; but we do not like passing purely futile legislation. If there is a reasonable chance of the industry going ahead under this bounty and the industry is of such magnitude as to make this worth while, I favour it. I would prefer to see the matter dealt with in another way. But one way is better than no way. I do not want to have my vote or any influence I have stand in the way of the revival of any industry in this country. Next, the minister should show that the plan suggested by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in his amendment, will not produce the industry. The minister at least owes an explanation to the committee, because if the amendment will produce the industry, the hon. member for Brome is right in his amendment. We should not do anything more than is essential to achieve our ends in the public interest, and if they will be achieved by a loan without interest for seven years, that is a great deal better than making a money grant. The minister should show to the committee that such is futile, if that is his belief.

Mr. FIELDING: It is not always easy to prove a negative, nor is it always easy to prove an affirmative. I cannot give the right hon. member an absolute assurance that this bounty will create the industry. All I can say is that the people most actively promoting it have assured me that the business will be done. I can give no assurance beyond that. I think they are acting in good faith, and that this bounty will create the copper industry in the way the industry is described. I am bound to give to the right hon. gentleman and the committee any information as it comes to me.

As to the effect of the amendment of the hon. member for Brome, if my right hon. friend asks me if I can give him any assurance that this will not be satisfactory, I have never before heard such a proposal, and I cannot tell what view will be taken of the amendment. My judgment is that they will not move a foot if this amendment is passed, but I cannot guarantee that such will be the case.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to press for an answer to my question whether the government, in view of the statements I have made and statements heretofore made in other quarters, are going to take such means as to compel companies to whom this bounty is given to disclose the actual content of precious metals and nickel in those ores. Are we to have that or not? And are we to subsidize those companies in view of the disclosures that have been made? If such a provision is inserted, I shall be glad to support the motion. If the minister consults the Department of Mines, he will find that they do not know the value of the precious metal content in those copper ores, and that, as regards Ontario, that has never been disclosed. Those metals are subject to taxation there, and the Department of Mines and the Department of Finance of this country ought to insist on these facts being disclosed before any bounty is given to any company, and especially to companies outside of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is referring to the question of companies refusing to disclose something during the war. I cannot answer that, as I had nothing to do with the administration of those affairs during the war. I know there was a great deal of talk of shipments of nickel to Germany during the war. I understand that was investigated by the government of the day, and that they were satisfied that the law was observed and that there was nothing wrong. So far as I know, companies have never been asked to disclose this, and I know of no reason why they should be asked.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are we still to continue in the position that we are not to know what the content is? Now is the time, if we are to bonus those companies, to compel them to disclose the content of precious metals, or the minister should produce a report from the Department of Mines showing that there is not a large content of precious metals in those ores. If that department says that there is not a large content of precious metals, I will accept the statement. I want an answer now to my question, and I will direct the attention of the government to the statement in Blackwood's of this month that those metals—and it is claimed that this is the scandal of the war—went to Germany throughout the war; that they were supplied largely by British and American firms, and that they came, as a matter of fact, from Canada. That has never yet been proved. When the question is up and we are subsidizing those companies with bounties, parliament ought to make this condition, that any company that gets a bounty on copper rods that come out of, say, our nickel mines, should be compelled to tell us how much of

precious metals is in those ores. This may give the government a source of taxation. We want systems of taxation as well as bounties in this country, and if outside companies control our mines, if they are taking these metals out of the country, and if Sir Alfred Mond, of the late British government, for years has taken the nickel of this country in matte form over to Wales and treated it and taken out those precious metals from our ores, that ought to be disclosed. Sir Alfred Mond has never disclosed that, and he has defied disclosure of it. His agents in this country have been very active to hide the fact from us. I ask the minister to insist on those companies disclosing the whole content of the ores from which they get these rods.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is nearly time in this country that we should cease harking back to the war about everything. The question is not what we have done. We have done our duty pretty well, we have had many troubles and trials during the war, and the people are now looking to see what we are going to do and not at what has been done. I do not think anything is gained by discussing these old issues, no matter on which side we may be. This is the situation in connection with the copper industry and something should be done to meet it. The raw copper of British Columbia goes to-day to the United States, where a large quantity is required. It is refined there and we buy it back again. That is a condition of things which even free traders would not, I suppose, care to have continue. We have an abundant supply of raw copper in this country, but the new companies that undertake to develop this industry cannot stand up against the outside competition of old and well-established businesses in a country like the United States. Concerning any other question there might be greater room for differences of opinion; but this is a case in which we are developing an industry that gets its raw material from the bowels of the earth, that raw material being of no value in its undeveloped state. I think, therefore, that it is well that we should do something to develop this potential asset. I believe in aiding this industry, which has for its object the development of one of our greatest national assets in the way of natural products. Under the present law, a manufacturer, say, of copper bars, can get his raw material free of duty, but if he attempts to manufacture a partly finished product to a further stage and sell it to his neighbour in Canada, though that neighbour lives across the street, he has to pay a duty on his importation. A man three miles from him, on the American side of the line, can send the manufactured article to the purchaser in Canada free of duty. This is an anomalous situation, and as a matter of fact, under present conditions, instead of giving the natural products of Canada a square deal our legislation is absolutely against them in favour of the American manufactured article, as well as the American raw material. I cannot see anything inconsistent with straight business methods in doing what the government proposes to do in order that the copper industry of Canada may be developed, and those who are manufacturing further products of the copper mines may be given a chance at least equal to that enjoyed by the American who can send in his goods now free of charge.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I realize that this is a debatable question and I do not wish to touch upon any disputable point to-day. The principal arguments that have been advanced in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) have reference to the taxation that will be imposed upon the people by granting a bounty to the copper industry. The question is also asked by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) as to what benefit the country will derive from the granting of this bounty. Laying aside the principle involved in the matter of his bonus, I think that it is good business for the Dominion of Canada to grant such a bonus, and I offer this opinion not from any particular point of view, but from the point of view of business generally. If any hon. member were interested in a business proposition by means of which, through the investment of $200,000 a year, he would derive a revenue of three and a half or four million dollars, there can be no question whatever that he would consider it excellent business. Well, that is precisely analogous to the present case; by the investment of $200,000 a year we shall save to the people of Canada between three and four million dollars which now goes to the United States. By granting this small concession we shall establish an industry in Canada providing returns such as I have stated, besides employment for from 1,000 to 2,000 persons who are now idle. I believe that hon. gentlemen will take this question into consideration favourably, purely from the business point of view, and altogether irrespective of the principle involved in the granting of a bonus. This parliament to-day is legislating for the welfare of the Dominion as a whole, and I consider that this is one instance in which it might do something to help a particular industry and, further than that, the whole country. The

taxation that will be incurred in connection with the bounty will, in my opinion, be greatly offset by the increased benefits that will be derived in the way of added revenue and greater prosperity, particularly to the province of British Columbia and the other provinces that are interested in copper mining.

Mr. GOOD: I am afraid the hon. member who has spoken (Mr. Humphrey) has fallen a victim to that hoary fallacy about keeping money at home. I do not think many hon. members will attach great importance to that argument. As to the amendment, it seems to me to be worthy of very serious consideration, even from the standpoint of the government. Personally, I do not believe in the bounty system, but, as I have said on a previous occasion, if we are bound to give some sort of assistance to industry it is a better form than tariff protection. Looking at the matter solely from the standpoint of those who believe in giving assistance to industry, it seems to me that the amendment is well worth considering. Because there will be no re-payment coming from the company until, I believe, 1931, and by that time, if there is anything in the proposition at all, the industry will have been well established, and will be well able to repay the money advanced to them. I do not suppose that the Minister of Finance would recommend the bounty unless there were reasonable prospect of the industry becoming established. Surely it would be very poor policy to grant a bounty if there were no prospects of permanent success. But if there is such a prospect then by 1931 the company will be established and can afford then to pay back to the people of Canada the small advance that will be made. I do wish to commend to the House, therefore, a sympathetic consideration of the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Something of evidence has been given to the committee as to the need of the bounty; I am thoroughly convinced of that myself. But I think the minister owes it to the committee to give us some information, and I really do not know why he has not got it, to show how the figures are arrived at. I can recall in connection with the lead bounties how the figures were arrived at, the basis of making the bounty being the equivalent of the handicap under which the industry would suffer were it existing. Surely the corresponding information should be forthcoming here. It seems to me that the committee is entitled to that information. Just what is the disadvantage that the industry would be at, without the bounty, as compared with its competitor? If there is any substantial disadvantage there will be no industry; we all know that by long and bitter experience. The theories in regard to all these things are fine, but their application is a different matter. How many people support those theories only until it comes to a question of their application?—the application shows them to be utterly futile. But we should have that information.

I have not the slightest sympathy with all the talk about a crime having been committed against this country in the export of nickel or any other of our minerals during the war. I had peculiarly to do with the export of nickel from the beginning to the end of the war, and I know the entire system adopted and the result. I would not contend for a moment that there was not a modicum of failure, but I do not think that in anything we undertook during the war was the success so complete as in the case of the control of the export of nickel. No matter what anyone may say in Blackwood's or any other magazine on the subject, he is simply talking rubbish for the sake of getting entry into the paper and probably making some money for himself.

As to the composition of our metals, while I have not gone over all of them seriatim, I do not doubt that the content of every metal that has been discovered in this country can be ascertained by examination of the records and reports of our Mines department. There is not the slightest doubt as to the ore covered by this bill. I guarantee that every detail of its composition has been on record for years in the Mines department. There is nothing to be found out in that regard, and I do not see that the subject affects the merits of the bill, but on the point where it does, I should like more information besides that given by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Humphrey) and the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in order to show that this is the right amount as nearly as we can tell that will overcome the handicap under which the industry would labour were it existent without the bonus.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. gentleman will specify substantially and clearly any information he wants, and if that information is available, I shall have a great deal of pleasure in getting it for him. I can only say that we have adopted these figures after discussion with the promoters of the industry. Of course, it is not what they want. They want more. But we believe that on these rates the industry will be established. That is our reason for proposing them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I became somewhat familiar with this matter about two or three years ago. I do not think there is any dispute that it does seem to be ridiculous that the brass manufacturer—the man who is manufacturing the product of the copper—although he uses Canadian copper, as a result of the present protective tariff—which in this instance is not protective at all but is a tax upon the Canadian producer—is worse off than if he moved his plant to Buffalo. That is, as a result of the duty on the raw material of copper, given for the purpose of aiding the first industry, the production of copper itself, unaccompanied by proper compensatory duties upon the more finished article, while it gives an apparent protective duty of 10 per cent to the brass manufacturer, it actually leaves him at a disadvantage of 2 per cent. Therefore, although we have a duty on the raw material, we are getting the benefit of the first process only, the extraction of the copper from the ground. Those were the figures two years ago, and I am quite confident they are the figures to-day. Consequently, where we ought to have large employment of labour in connection with all the different processes of this industry, we are just simply producing the raw material. I take it that my hon. friend has had those figures before him and has calculated what he could do in order to offset the difference.

I might say that the result of it all comes from an accident. Things are overlooked from time to time. There used to be no duty whatever upon the by-products of copper. We had no industry in connection with them. When the war came we had to have these by-products. There was no competition when the industry started and those engaged in it had the further protection given by the 7½ per cent customs tax imposed for war purposes. It is by reason of the tax being cancelled that we are in this position to-day, because while reductions have been made on the import duties, on the other hand the striking off of that tax, which before gave the industry a net protection of 5 per cent, leaves it in a position where it is at a disadvantage to the extent of from 2 to 2½ per cent. I do not think there is very much doubt about these figures. Of course, I should like to see the fullest information given, but, speaking frankly, I can see absolutely no reason why this industry should not be bonused.

Mr. GOULD: I am not yet clear as to why we should have to subsidize this industry. We have practically a monopoly of copper, because we are told that the United States must get her main supply from Canada. Therefore it seems to me that having this monopoly we can charge the United States a high price for any material she requires. The question asked by the right hon. leader of the Opposition is the sort of question we have been asking many times in reference to tariff and other matters, that is: What is the reason for the disability, and what is its extent? The question is asked in regard to this proposed bounty, but it is unanswered. A similar question has been asked to my own certain knowledge during the last four years in regard to all the tariff items that have come before this House. But it always remains unanswered. The people would like to have a satisfactory answer. In all cases it does appear that the cards are absolutely stacked against the people. Indeed, it is demonstrated by the fact that this and similar questions asked by the representatives of the people remain unanswered. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) stated that we should not be always referring to the war period. I quite agree with him. But in almost the very next sentence the hon. gentleman stated that the highly organized industries of the United States would force Canadian industry out of business were it not protected. This is getting to be quite as common a warning as references to the war years; or quite as common as the remark by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who invariably retorts to certain objections, " Well, we have precedent for this; you people did it; consequently we are doing it."

Mr. VIEN: If the remark is true why does my hon. friend object to our repeating it until he understands it?

Mr. GOULD: Well, until those who have the spending of the money produce evidence that we are wrong, we are entitled to our opinion; and the people of Canada have on many occasions spoken in favour of the opinions which we express.

Mr. VIEN: Not yesterday.

Mr. GOULD: No, not yesterday, but Ontario is just a small part of Canada.

Mr. CALDWELL: That was not a federal issue.

Mr. GOULD: I approve of the amendment which is before the committee, on the principle that those who receive these subsidies shall consider the amount advanced to them in the nature of a loan and that it shall be

repaid to the people of Canada. That will be one factor at least in restoring confidence in the minds of the people.

Mr. FORKE: I wish to say just a word in regard to the suggestion that if certain things are not done certain people will have to go out of business. I have had perhaps more experience this session than I otherwise would have had because of the position I have occupied in this group, and the most disheartening thing I have met with has been the continuous stream of people I have had up in my room who have told me it is impossible for them to carry on business in Canada unless they get a little more protection. Now, the psychological effect of that statement, repeated over and over again, is that those who make it themselves finally come to believe it. If the manufacturers and business men would only recognize their own ability, would only recognize the virility and industry and intelligence of the people of this country and attempt to put their businesses on a paying basis, they would succeed much faster than they will by this everlasting cry of "a little more protection." I do not think the amendment offered by the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is at all out of place. If this industry is going to be a paying proposition, they will have four or five years to repay the amount now advanced; why should the people of Canada not at least get their money back? I am prepared to support the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. McMaster) negatived: Yeas, 42; Nays, 77.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY ON HEMP

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 215, respecting the payment of bounties on certain manufactures of hemp.

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

On section 3—Limitation.

Mr. McMASTER: I desire to propose the same amendment to this clause which I proposed in connection with the bounties on copper. The same principles apply, and I do not propose to detain the committee in arguing the point.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McMaster moves: that the following paragraph be added to paragraph 3, to be known as paragraph 3A:

[Mr. Gould.]

3A. The payments so made shall be considered as advances by way of loan and the amounts so paid to those receiving the same shall be repayable by them to the Crown as follows: One-fifth on the 1st day of July, 1935; one-fifth, on the first day of July, 1936; one-fifth on the 1st day of July, 1937; two-fifths on the 1st day of July, 1938; with interest on any overdue instalment at the rate of six per cent per annum. Any failure to pay any instalment when the same falls due shall cause subsequent instalments at the option of the Governor in Council to become due.

Mr. McMURRAY: The object of this bill is to establish in western Canada very largely and in the province of Manitoba particularly, I believe a new industry for the growing of hemp and its manufacture into binder twine. I understand that an experienced man from the north of Ireland, where this industry has been developed as highly probably as in any other part of the world, came to Canada some years ago and made investigations as to the possibility of growing this hemp in Manitoba. I understand that it was established to his entire satisfaction that hemp of the very finest quality could be grown there, of a quality equal to that which the factories in the north of Ireland had been purchasing from Russia before the war. Hemp has been grown in the West for some three years. I have seen it growing, and while I do not know anything about its quality I know that it grows very readily and very high. I have been assured by this gentleman from Ireland that this hemp is of the very best quality and will produce the very finest twine when manufactured. Another feature of the situation is that the twine which we use in Canada is very largely manufactured outside of Canada, manufactured practically by one company ,the International Harvester Company, a large American corporation with a vast capital. Twine has gone up in western Canada to a very high and unusual price, and is more or less absolutely in the control of this company. The object of this bill is to create a new industry. I agree that there is a proper place for the granting of bounties and subsidies. This is a new concern with a reasonable prospect of being successful. I would be opposed to the granting of a bounty if there was not a reasonable prospect of success.

Mr. McMASTER: May I ask a question? If there is a reasonable chance of success why should it be objected to that the industry should repay to the state the amount which the state is now advancing to it?

Mr. McMURRAY: I will answer my hon. friend as I proceed with my argument. We have western Canada in the grip of this monopoly I spoke of. We have a field out

there for the building up of a magnificent industry. We have a large market in western Canada for binder twine, one of the largest markets in the world. The great trouble with our manufactures in Canada has been that their market has been limited as compared with the United States, and for that reason on account of the greater overhead expense they were unable to compete with the American factories. But for this binder twine industry we should have a field as large as that of the United States, and one in which we can compete against them successfully. There is I think no doubt at all that this industry will succeed if the bounty is large enough in the first instance to enable them to compete against this monopoly that now holds the people of western Canada in thrall.

The establishment of such an industry should have the following effects: First there should be a reduction in the price of twine for the farmers of western Canada. My hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Hoey), speaking the other day alleged that he believed that this would create a rate war between this new company and the monopoly in the United States, and that in his opinion the price of binder twine would be lower in western Canada for a number of years to come. He apparently was solicitous of the welfare of these capitalists who propose to come to Canada and establish this industry. They were quite willing to come to this country and risk some four or five million dollars in establishing such an industry. Their experts had come over here and looked over the field and were satisfied the industry would succeed if given a reasonable opportunity. I do not know on what ground my hon. friend sets up his opinion against that of these experienced men who had investigated the matter. I was rather surprised with his argument. I would have thought that a reduction in the price of twine to the farmers in western Canada would have appealed to him, and I was rather surprised that he set up his opinion against those of these experts who had looked over the field.

Mr. HOEY: Does not my hon. friend see where his reasoning is leading him to? When the price is reduced and the hemp factory is in jeopardy we will have a demand for a protective tariff on binder twine coming to this country from the United States.

Mr. McMURRAY: My hon. friend is setting up his opinion against that of the experts who looked over the ground and on whose opinion these capitalists were willing to risk four or five million dollars in this industry.

Mr. HOEY: Anticipating protection.

Mr. McMURRAY: There is a large field for this industry. In that respect it stands out from most other manufactures in this country. It will have a larger field in which to sell its product than its competitor in the United States. Now what will this do for Canada? Annually there is going out of this country from fifteen to sixteen million dollars for binder twine purchased at an exorbitantly high rate. Supposing this new industry did not lower the price of twine, this fifteen or sixteen million dollars would remain in Canada and help to build up industries in this country, and would give labour to thousands of our own people here. One hon. member immediately opposite me suggested the other day that we should give a bounty to the farmer who grew the hemp. The farmer who grows the hemp is in an entirely satisfactory condition, and this industry will mean giving him another market right at his own door in which he can sell his products. If he can get more for the production of hemp than he can for the wheat he produces he will grow hemp; if he cannot get a price for his hemp equal to that he gets for his wheat he will not grow the hemp. So what we are really doing is to bring a market right to the farmer's own door.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does not that same argument apply to the manufacturer of hemp —that if he could secure an adequate return he would produce?

Mr. McMURRAY: The argument is this: The industry will be fighting against the monopoly in the United States, something my hon. friend is always prepared to fight. We have an abundance of cheap power that could be used in the manufacture of hemp into twine. The production of hemp will also assist in giving a diversified crop production on the farms of western Canada. The lands surrounding the city of Winnipeg are more or less fallowed and infested with weeds. The production of hemp will take the place of summer fallowing very largely and will be exceedingly profitable. By reason of the cheap power to be had by the manufacturing industry, by reason of the closeness of the market, by reason of the fact that the hemp manufactured will be produced on farming lands in western Canada and should be sold to the manufacturer at a cheaper price than it can be produced for on the higher priced lands of the United States, I believe this industry should succeed against the competition of the United States.

Mr. SPENCER: Why is the land surrounding Winnipeg polluted with weeds?

Mr. McMURRAY: Because the farmers of western Canada have not been farming properly.

Mr. SPENCER: Does not my hon. friend realize that flax is the worst possible thing to pollute the land?

Mr. McMURRAY: My hon. friend represents a farming community but he has a most indefinite idea of what is produced upon a farm. Flax grows about two and a half feet high, and hemp eight or ten feet high; they are two different products altogether. In addition to what I have already said as to why we should encourage this industry there is the fact that employment will be given to the working people of western Canada. For that reason this legislation should have the support of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) and the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson), as it will have the effect of bringing to Winnipeg, or to the immediate environments of that city, a large enterprise which will take care of our working people there the year round. This proposition is a very desirable thing and should be supported not only by the members for Winnipeg, but by all the farming representatives from western Canada. I appeal to these hon. members to support a bill that will bring to the west a concern that should free them from the monopoly from which they are now suffering by reason of the International Harvester Company. I appeal to them to endorse a proposition which will create a market for a large acreage of hemp produced in the West, will assist in better farming methods, will keep millions and millions of dollars in this country, and will have the effect of freeing us from the domination of the United States. The farther we can advance along this line the better it will be. In the interest of some of our needs in the future it may be very desirable that we should have industries in this country that will render us absolutely independent of the United States.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What about the binder twine manufacturing plant at Brantford?

Mr. McMURRAY: That is a small plant and does not, I believe, sell binder twine in western Canada at all. It is so insignificant that this great monopoly does not bother to fight it. But if a real competitor comes into the field then you may expect to see a war in connection with the sale of binder twine.

[Mr. McMurray.]

In reply to the very fair and reasonable proposition advanced by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) I have this to say by way of argument: We are to-day fighting a powerful monopoly. The manufacturers who propose to establish themselves in Canada contemplate investing a very large sum, probably some four or five million dollars. There is every prospect of success as I view the matter. Still, these men are going into a very hard fight, and I think it is only fair, in view of the benefit to be derived by our working people and the farmers of Canada as a whole, that they should receive some encouragement when they are undertaking to establish a new concern. It is not like making a new establishment in a line which has been in existence for some time; these men are venturing into a new field. And while the prospects look good, difficulties may arise. If the promoters are willing to undertake the risk why should we not support them to a reasonable extent? The proposed bounty is not extravagant in its nature; in fact it is rather small. If I have any quarrel with the government, or with the minister, as I said before, it is that it is not proposed to give a bounty of such a character that assurance may be made doubly sure even from the very commencement. The bounty is small; it is not given for a lengthy period of time; it is on a sliding scale. Nevertheless the prospects for success are very bright. There is an opportunity here of establishing in western Canada an industry that will be indigenous to the country, that will stabilize conditions in the west, that will stimulate the farmer, that will provide employment for our people—in a word the proposition is one that should have the support of every western representative in the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could hardly be expected to let the opportunity pass of making a few observations on the speech of the hon. member for North Winnipeg.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not favour as a rule this method of encouraging Canadian industry, or to put the matter in this way, this method of securing Canadian industry. It is an attempt, however, to re-establish the making of binder twine in Canada, and I am only anxious that that should be done. But I feel a sense of humiliation that the industry should at the present stage of our

history be in the condition in which it is. It has a history; a very few words will review that, and it is worth reviewing. We had for many years a protective duty on binder twine, never a very high duty, always a low one. It was reduced from 12½ per cent to 10 per cent in 1897, and then with a great flourish of trumpets it was abolished, wiped entirely away in 1898. This was the offering which the government at that time laid on the altar of western Canadian opinion, in order that it might atone in some degree for the apostacy of that date. The prophets of the administration marched through western Canadian hills and rolled the ball of binder twine from every platform, accompanied by professions of great interest in the agricultural industry of our land. Indeed, for those who adhered to the free trade notions of ancient days, the supposed success of the binder twine industry, notwithstanding the absence of duty, was a perennial argument; it never failed to be presented on all suitable or non-suitable occasions. In the last two parliaments, the old wiping away of binder twine duties came back as an article of discussion in the House, with redoubled vigour, re-doubled because the vigour of hon. gentlemen across the way in the cause of free trade was itself re-doubled, multiplied many times over by the fact that they had gone out of office. On the part of those who in the course of time came to form the Progressive party, the stock contention was, year after year, debate after debate, that the binder twine industry of Canada was flourishing, demonstrating to all and sundry that all this claim for duty as a necessity for progressive industry was a pure figment of the imagination. We have now come through the experience of this session. In olden times—no, not olden, just a few sessions ago—I was driven myself to take up the cudgels in defence of the binder twine industry, and I laboured to show that as a consequence of the wiping out of the duty, the industry, while it remained, was before us in an emaciated, gasping form, and that if our other industries, as fundamental as that, were in like condition, Canada would be in a pitiful state indeed. Some hon. gentlemen to my left remember the arguments of that day, but they will remember how they were replied to and believed to be refuted by hon. gentlemen who are now sitting to your right, Mr. Chairman, and by the leader of the Progressive party of that time who contended that everything was fine and flourishing; that the binder twine industry was still the living example of the glorious effects of free trade. This session we have heard, first from the lips of a leading member of the Progressive party, the declaration, a perfectly true declaration, that at the present time we are making in our Dominion actually 10 per cent of the binder twine we use. Binder twine is one of the great articles of consumption of our country, because we use, in proportion to our people, an immense quantity of this article. After this experience we find ourselves, on the admission of an hon. member to my left, producing in Canada 10 per cent and buying the rest in other lands. How splendid a state of affairs it would be if the same could be said of the other great articles of production in this country! That is precisely where we would be under the policy of hon. gentlemen to my left. An hon. member shakes his head. I wonder why the difference applied to this article? Not only have we the testimony of an hon. gentleman to my left,—and others would say the same if they would look into the facts as thoroughly as he has—but we have the testimony of the eloquent hon. gentleman across the way who declares, as regards the purchase of binder twine, that we are in the grip of a big American monopoly at this hour. I watched the expression on the face of the hon. member for Brome as he looked, in bleak and pained dismay across the way at that family which was once so happy, of which he was an honoured member himself, from which the statement was hurled forth, out of the very camp and court of Liberalism, that free trade on binder twine had landed it in the grip of an American monopoly. All these things have their lessons, and this government that in other times was responsible for the policy that had been pursued for the last 20 years, that initiated it themselves, they themselves members of a government that created the public opinion that forced them against their judgment to do this, are now putting forward this feeble effort to resuscitate, if they can, the industry that they have driven virtually to destruction. These things have their lessons, and all the while no one in this country has benefited at all over the space of time covered by the policy. To-day we are virtually without competition. We have in Canada one or two industries, perhaps three; but they are managed from the United States, and they do just what they are told. They are kept here, I doubt not, just in order that, if possible, they may seduce us to continue the policies that lead us into the humiliating position we are in.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are many of the protected industries in this country not managed from the United States?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not by any means, not to the extent of an almost infinitesimal fraction. They are Canadian industries; American capital may be in them, but they are not part of a big American ring.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the Imperial Oil Company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Imperial Oil Company is, in the main, a Canadian company. How funny it is to see hon. gentlemen to your right rise! If such is the case, why do they not pursue their policy past binder twine and get us into such a shape that we shall have to give bounties to everything raised in this Dominion? I thought hon. gentlemen to my left would be slow to rise.

Mr. PRITCHARD: Is it true that we are buying binder twine cheaper than we did before the duty was removed and the wages were increased?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not. Binder twine is cheaper than it was four years ago; most things are; but it is much dearer than it was when we had the 12 per cent duty. I think it is dearer this year than it was last. As I say, out of this very school stands the prophet who declares that we are landed now in the grip of an American monopoly. He is not far from the fact; substantially he is within the truth, and out of this school stands one who says we are making in Canada 10 per cent of this big staple article of consumption by the people of this Dominion. Yes, I support the legislation. I will support any such effort, however feeble, and I only hope at least a measure of success will result from it.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I am quite interested in the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). Some of us have memories that reach back to those years when binder twine was 17 cents a pound, when we had a protective duty and dear labour.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was that?

Mr. PRITCHARD: That was when we built a binder twine factory ourselves, and that is what they told us at the time it was 17 cents a pound, that these corporations he is talking about would force us down to a cost of 6 cents a pound and put us out of business. What happened at that time? Many men went into the business, and if many of the farmers had put all their money into the business at that time, they would have made more money than they would in farming. The price of binder twine came down to 6 cents, and we succeeded in meeting that. My opinion is that no industry starting in this country, in which it has an opportunity of making good, has a right to receive protection from other industries. Such industries have a right to stand on their own feet without any support. I am in entire support of the amendment. We have been carrying on too long this system of subsidizing infant industries in order to establish them, and I do not know how long it takes to get some of them established. We are apparently undertaking to carry more and more of these industries; this must stop some time, and my opinion is that we should stop it right now. We have been bonusing our railways; indeed in all our smaller towns—for instance, in my own town, we have been giving any amount of money to industries, and what has happened? The money has gone and the industry has gone. I am opposed to the continuation of granting bonuses; I am opposed to this particular one, and I will support the amendment.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I regret I cannot agree with the argument put forward by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray). I am aware that considerable pressure is being brought to bear from Winnipeg to have this particular matter go through; yet I cannot see how this case differs from hundreds of others that might be brought up from different parts of the country. I note, in the circular sent out by the Winnipeg Board of Trade one of the statements in favour of this matter is that this will be a source of revenue to the federal government by establishing an additional industry which will be subject to taxation. Possibly that is what has appealed to the Minister of Finance. But I would submit that from the standpoint of good business, so far as the federal government is concerned, we may have to wait a very considerable time before any money secured in the form of taxation upon this industry will equal what will be expended in the proposed bonus. I think we can all agree with the member for North Winnipeg when he speaks about the fertility of the western plains, and the possibility of producing raw material in great abundance. there. I have very little doubt that is true. We can also agree, I think, that there is a splendid local market; undoubtedly the western farmers consume a great deal more of

these articles than are required elsewhere in this country. Still further, we all know that Winnipeg has cheap power and for that reason production should be carried on without a very heavy expenditure. But all these reasons would seem to show that this is a good business proposition, and if it is I cannot see why those who are interested in investing money should not come into the country without any other encouragement. We are told that if the prices are lowered the farmers will benefit, but I fail to see anything in the bill which will in any way ensure that the prices will be lowered, or that the alleged monopoly will be broken. We are also informed that this industry will be a very great benefit to the labouring classes. Well, if reasonable wages are paid and if there is steady work it may be advantageous to them. But there is no indication whatever that the rights of the labour people in this regard will be respected in this industry any more than they have been in any other industry.

We have been told that British capital is willing to come in and invest in this country. Let me remind hon. members that the statement was also made in the committee on Banking and Commerce that our banks have plenty of money to lend. If this is such a good thing and if the securities are going to be so sound there is no particular reason why British capital should not come in and the Canadian banks should not help to finance the institution while it is producing. I would also suggest, that there are other alternatives which the government might consider. Some of us are very much interested in municipal or provincial enterprises. I cannot see why something of this kind should not be encouraged in the same way as are those enterprises. Or why not, one might ask, bonus the farmers' co-operative societies that are already engaged in various types of productive industry, and if there is any benefit in the undertaking let those societies reap it? I might go so far as to suggest that there are some labour organizations which, if sufficiently bonused, could guarantee to carry on an industry of this kind. These are some of the alternatives to bonusing a group of British capitalists in the way proposed.

With regard to the amendment, I confess I am almost at a loss to know how to vote. As I am opposed to the principle of granting bonuses it seems rather strange to support a motion granting in any form a privilege of this kind. On the other hand, until such time as we have greater control over our industry, and so long as private industry is the rule, I am willing to try experiments. It may be in this instance a good thing to give this particular private industry an opportunity to develop. But more than that, I am rather anxious to test the bona fides of those who are putting forward this proposition, on the ground that it is in the general interest. I submit that if this is indeed in the public welfare no group of men should hesitate to take the position that if the public advances money it should be in the shape of a loan which should have the first claim on the industry. For that reason I propose to support the amendment.

Mr. EVANS: I am opposed to the granting of this bounty on the same ground that I oppose other bounties. No industry has been benefited, or has benefited this country, that has been established artificially. The history of bounties in Canada is just as sorry a spectacle, just as much a delusion and a fallacy as any other form of the old National Policy which was adopted by the Liberal government from its predecessors in 1897. There has been a cry in this House against Americans benefiting by the exploitation of our natural resources. The bounties of 1897 and 1899, however, were given entirely to American promoters. The two companies established at Cape Breton and Sault Ste. Marie were formed for the benefit of American promoters. In one case where money was given for the establishment of a plant, no steel was rolled until years afterwards. These two companies received many millions of Canadian money, the Sydney company, $6,500,000 and the Algoma company $2,600,000. What benefit did the Canadian people derive from those grants? Did we get steel any cheaper, or did our railway constructors get their rails at any lower rate? No. We paid from $11 to $13 a ton higher for our rails during that period than did any other country in the world; we could have secured them that much cheaper outside had we free trade. The bounties that were given to those two companies during those years more than paid the whole of the wages which the industries paid out to their employees. There was another bounty paid these mills in the years 1901 and 1902, but it was not until 1904 that one ingot was rolled in either of them. Why our government to-day is so eager to create monopolies by the granting of bounties and bonuses as well as tariff protection and the placing of embargoes on the export of raw material is more than I can understand. The steel bounties present one of the worst exhibitions of corruption and graft, and these bounties which the government now proposes but finds it hard to excuse, are likely to lead

to similar evils. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) I think is mistaken in some of the statements he has made. In 1898 the duty was taken off binder twine. We had an understanding about that time with the United States regarding manila from the Philippines, under which no undue import advantages were to be granted to their manufacturers as against ours. But I think the American manufacturers had an advantage of one-eighth of a cent per pound over ours, and we were reimbursing our manufacturers at the time to that extent, perhaps more. But during this period we never got twine in the West under 13, 14, 15 and 16 cents a pound. I am speaking of the early years of my settlement there. Before the war the farmers, under free trade, were getting twine as low as 7 and 8 cents a pound. I know this personally because I bought twine every season for over thirty years. I make the assertion that last year we could have bought twine at least 2 cents a pound cheaper had there been free trade in this commodity. Nominally twine is on the free list, but it is hedged about with such customs regulations that it can hardly be said to enter free. Last year an effort was made to bring the anti-dumping clause into force on an importation of twine by the United Farmers of Ontario, but it failed. That we are in the grip of an American monopoly in respect to this industry is simply a myth. If there is any industry languishing in this country it is not owing to free trade; the cause must be looked for elsewhere, and it is to be found in the fallacy of the National Policy, which advances the price of everything we have to buy and thus forces our cost of production out of line with that of other countries.

The best protection our manufacturers can have, and which this new industry in the West ought to cultivate, is a national sentiment. There is no doubt that our manufacturers have alienated this sentiment until to-day they find themselves more and more at a disadvantage under the tariff system. A truly national policy of "Canada for the Canadians, with fair play for all," is the best protection that our manufacturers can have. I say, let us be done with the whole system of tariff protection, bonuses and bounties.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, the importance of the proposed legislation is my only justification for spending even five minutes in discussing it. I have a good deal of sympathy with my western friends who look with misgiving at anything resembling protection. I remember when this proposal was brought to my attention a year ago last February I loked at it askance because I realized that what we do as a matter of course provincially in the West is looked upon as straight protection when done by the federal authorities. In analyzing the activities of the provincial governments of the West, I naturally am led to review those of my own province of Saskatchewan, where we have given assistance to various industries, very much to their advantage. I have never taken the ground that no kind of assistance should be given industry for fear it might be called protection. It seems to me that this system is the least objectionable form of protection, because it is terminable, while the other kind that we dislike so much is apparently interminable. That is the great difference between the two.

Let me cite some of the things we have been doing in Saskatchewan. For instance, we have for many years given money at 3 per cent to our co-operative creamery, we have given it office accommodation, and we have been paying the freight on cream to the central plant. All this is in the nature of subsidies, bounties or assistance. But as a result we have the satisfaction to-day of having established one of the best co-operative creameries and cold storage plants anywhere in the Dominion. It having been developed into a successful undertaking, assistance has been withdrawn. Then again, we have two stockyard companies in the province to each of which we have granted a straight bonus of $25,000. My hon. friends from the West thought that was all right. How is it altogether wrong when we come down here and do exactly the same thing federally in connection with the hemp industry? A third instance is the substantial grant or bonus which the Saskatchewan government gave towards the building of telephone lines.

Mr. GOULD: Is it not a fact that while the hon. minister was a member of the Saskatchewan government it passed a law prohibiting municipalities from granting bonuses or subsidies to induce industries to locate within their boundaries?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that was in connection with the railways.

Mr. GOULD: Also in connection with mills and such like.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There may be occasions when municipal bodies should not be subject to the temptation of competing with one another for the establishment of industries. But there is not such competition between provinces. The Saskatchewan govern-

ment also gave an initial grant at the time the co-operative elevator company was established, and since then, until quite recently at least, the trading account has been guaranteed by the provincial authorities all the way from 75 per cent down.

Mr. KNOX: Were not these grants by the provincial government made to publicly owned utilities?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Certainly not, they are co-operative institutions owned by the people. The principle of this form of assistance has been recognized times without number and has never been condemned in Saskatchewan. I can understand my hon. friends' feelings in regard to this matter, because I know that the environment here is different to what we are accustomed to in Saskatchewan. Here we are suspected of sinister designs upon the Treasury when we suggest any form of assistance to industry, while the same thing could be done by the western provinces and be thought perfectly all right. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in supporting the establishment and encouragement of this new industry. Why is it necessary to develop it? It has been developed up to the present to the extent of only ten per cent of our requirements. Our demands for binder twine alone, leaving out the other cordage commodities, have grown annually. We have grown this year to be the largest wheat export country in the world; we are the second largest wheat producing country. Surely, therefore, we should not any longer have to depend on a foreign country for our binder twine. When we first went into the West we had to make our own binding material out of straw. The proposal now is to make our own binder twine through the production of a commodity called hemp fibre, something that is indigenous to this country. Something that can be manufactured here. A band of Winnipeg men have put over $100,000 of their own capital into experiments connected with the growing of hemp. These experiments, carried on without aid for about fifteen years, were on two occasions almost on the point of success, but something always happened. It does seem to me, therefore, that if any industry deserves assistance of this kind it is the hemp industry. I recall the time during the war when there was a dearth of twine; our shipping was in jeopardy; the raw material had to come from the Philippines and in some instances from Mexico. It is true that the twine was being manufactured in the United States, but they had to depend very largely upon foreign countries for their raw material, and even if those countries were friendly, the dangers of the sea were great. I have been impressed with the importance of the production of two things within our own country: One is fuel and the other is twine, and the production of both in Canada is possible. I see that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is smiling now; he thinks I am advocating his fad, protection. But it is a terminable kind of protection. There are certain kinds of medicine, like strychnine, for example, which are beneficial if taken in small quantities, but which if taken in larger doses will knock you out. I propose that we take the medicinal dose, something that will do us good, not something that will kill us. The question has been asked, why does this industry not start up of its own volition.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I wonder if the hon. member for Brome ever had anything to do with starting an industry, even as small as this.

Mr. McMASTER: I started my own law.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is quite a different proposition; there are certain advantages there that do away with the need for any kind of assistance. Now, at the annual meetings of the Dairy Association in Saskatchewan I used to warn the farmers that as soon as their industry began to be self-sustaining, as soon as it could stand on its own feet, their assistance would be lessened or withdrawn. I used to say at Saskatoon: We are going to take a certain amount of assistance off this year; we are going to stop paying the express to the central creameries, and next year we are going to stop assisting you in the matter of office staff and office accommodation." It was all right so long as they knew that these curtailments were coming; and it always brought them to time when I would say to them: "You do not want to be in the same category as the eastern manufacturer, wanting this assistance forever." When I would say that they would immediately come across and agree to let the assistance drop. That is what we propose here. We have had two indications this year that these bounties are terminable. They may come along and ask that the bounty be further extended, but surely we can have backbone enough to say nay to them. Take the question of the flax bounty. If I were to give my candid opinion, I think we should have extended that bounty for another year, but

rather than put ourselves in the position of being led on by this bounty proposition, we terminated the flax bounty which was being paid to the institution at Guelph. So with the bounty on oil; that has been adjusted so that it will disappear, I think, at the end of another year. We must either assist this hemp industry in some legitimate way, in some way that we can see the end of, or we shall have to go on forever buying our twine from foreign countries. Which do we prefer?

I remember the time when we could take out almost in one car the whole binder twine requirements of Saskatchewan, but since that time the requirement has never ceased to grow, and I am confident that it will keep on growing larger and larger as the country becomes settled. The question is, are we to continue buying our binder twine from another country and running the chance of going without it at some critical time, or are we to develop a commodity that can be produced right in Canada? For many years I found that the soil on my own farm was so rich that it would not grow wheat to maturity in time to escape the frost. In many districts in northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba it is not good business to grow wheat, but it may be an exceedingly profitable business to grow hemp. I am satisfied that hemp can be produced in northern Alberta as well as in the southern part of the province by irrigation; that flax seed and flax fibre can also be successfully produced in those districts, and that this industry may ultimately be developed in Manitoba and in the entire West—right to the Pacific, if you like. When I became interested in this product last year I gave instructions to the Director of Experimental Farms to try out the growing of hemp in all the experimental farms, and it was found that it could be grown in every province. I say there is no reason why, when this industry gets well established, it cannot be extended all over Canada. When I had the painful opportunity of reading the speech of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) on this question, he made what seemed to me to be the strongest possible argument for this bounty: he suggested that the price of International twine would be so cut that the new institution would be put out of business. Well, if no assistance were given, that is what would happen, and that is exactly the justification for the assistance. In the early days of an enterprise like this, when the overhead is large and the turnover is small, the cost per pound must be excessive, and if you are going to get into competition with an old-established institution like the International Harvester Company, they can cut their price by two or three cents and beat you out. Under those circumstances, unless a business were enormously strong it would soon have to close its doors. That is not a dream; that is not protectionist theory; it is something that anybody can realize would happen if you start something that comes into competition with an institution that has been long established and has attained full growth. I do not think I can give my hon. friends any better illustration than this: If you take an immature farm animal—a calf, a pig, or a foal—and put it in the same pen with a full grown animal and leave it to rustle for itself, how do you think it will flourish? With these illustrations I will sit down as the weather is getting rather warm.

Mr. EVANS: I should like to make one correction as the minister has created a false impression. Where help has been given to an industry in Saskatchewan it has always been a public owned utility organized to help the people help themselves. It is this creating monopolies that will in the end fleece the people that we object to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not understand my hon. friend. In the little telephone companies that were organized it was the individuals who benefited. It was not a giant monopoly, and this is not a giant monopoly. We are simply encouraging new capital to come to Canada to engage in a new industry that my hon. friend and thousands of others require in this country.

Mr. EVANS: It is not to be publicly owned.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I prefer making my own product. If we are going to buy everything abroad we shall soon not be able to buy what we want at home.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing that so cheers the heart of the old battle-scarred veteran as the sight of a young, vigorous and belligerent recruit coming to his aid. I welcome the adhesion even of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). I do not need any memory at all to recall the part the hon. gentleman played when in the ranks of the foe. There dins in my ears even now the battle cry against special privilege that rang through the Progressive press and from Farmer and Progressive and Liberal platforms in western Canada. Special privilege was the curse of the nation, special privilege was

something against which every righteous man, every honest man, strikes his blow. And in that battle right in the ranks, yes, in the very front, stood the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and if he did not carry the flag or ride a horse he at least beat the drum. But protection now is all right so long as it is mild. He finds that he cannot enter the lists now against special privilege because it is borne in upon him that all the while he was crying out himself and his newspapers crying behind him, we were giving special privilege ourselves, he says. This town and that town, this province and that province were given special privileges even while we were in the midst of a crusade against it, and what he says is quite true. That is just what they were doing. There is not a town to-day in all western Canada that lives up for a day of the three hundred and sixty-five to any free trade principle or any anti-special privilege principle—not one of them. Every one of them gives special advantages in the interests of the home town, and if we do it in the case of one town in competition against the other, who is going to say that it is wrong to do it when it is competition between one nation against the other? Consequently the whole failure, yes, the whole futility and utter nonsense of the crusade is borne back into the mind of the Minister of Agriculture. So he stands and professes his faith now; yea he says, though we were sinning against the faith then, even while we were singing the psalms of free trade, I prefer now to come right out into the open and do something so long as it is of a mild type and purely medicinal, and purely for new industries. I was against all protection, he says, because they went and applied it after the industry grew up, but here is a case, he says, where we need a new industry. We need a new binder twine industry in this country. Yes, we have to start it in order that we may not be dependent upon the binder twine industry of the United States. It never seemed to dawn on him that the industry he wants to recreate is the industry that he by his theory destroyed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. It never grew its raw material.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, but it made its finished product, and it is the finished product we are interested in.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: More interested in the raw material.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then it is not that the minister wants binder twine. He wants hemp, is that it? I thought we had to have our binder twine industry in order to have it made right here at home and not be dependent upon a foreign country for our supply. That is what he was arguing, certainly it was.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Get the hemp and you will get the binder twine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid the minister had better stand on the ground he was on. It is a whole lot better than the ground he is being jerked to now. Certainly we want our binder twine. Everybody wants that.

I want to answer what the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) says. It is too frequent a practice to give from some recollection reservoir bold and unstudied figures as to what was paid in days gone by for various articles. I took the trouble to get from authoritative sources that I am prepared to show to any member of this House the wholesale average prices of binder twine through all these years, and I have them year by year. It is the wholesale prices that determine the effect of the policy. You may at a certain period have a costlier system of distribution than at another, you may in earlier times in western Canada have had a costlier distribution of binder twine; it is the wholesale prices, however, that are the test of the value of the policy in so far as you judge the value by the results. Now the figures are these, and I ask hon. gentlemen to recall that it was in 1897 that the Minister of Finance reduced the duty from 12½ to 10 cents and in 1898 that he wiped it all away. Consequently we would expect in 1899 the great benefit to the consumer to be most marked. Now I will read the figures. In 1895 the average wholesale price —this is for 500 feet of binder twine, and the rest would be in proportion—was 6 cents; 1896, 5¾ cents; 1897, 6 cents; 1898, 5½ cents; 1899, 9 cents. That was the first year of free trade in binder twine.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the right hon. leader of the Opposition got comparative prices of the raw material for those years? That is very necessary to have, because your raw material may have gone up in price.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I have not the comparative prices of raw material. I thought I was answering direct contradictions as to the value of the finished product; that is what I was answering. But if the test is to be switched to raw material I am prepared to get the figures on that too. In 1899 the average price was 9 cents; 1900, 11½ cents; 1901, 7½ cents; 1902, 11 cents;

1903, 10½ cents; 1904, 10¼ cents; 1905, 9½ cents, 1906, 10 cents; 1907, 9⅝ cents; 1908, 8¼ cents; 1909, 7½ cents; 1910, 7½ cents; 1911, 6½ cents; 1912, 7¼ cents; 1913, 9½ cents, 1914, 9 cents; 1915, 7¾ cents; 1916, 9⅝ cents; 1917, 15⅝; 1918, 23¼ cents; 1919, 21¼ cents. These latter were war-time years and are not a fair criterion. But the period before the war would be a fair criterion, and in so far as the value of the product and the cost to the consumer is to be the test of the wisdom of the policy I wonder what is the lesson of these figures that I now produce. What do they show? Out of twenty-five binder twine factories—I have not the exact number immediately at hand—at least fifteen went into bankruptcy. They were not merged in some other concern, they went into bankruptcy. Some three or four of them were destroyed by fire, and were never rebuilt. Two or three others went into other lines of production mainly, continued to produce a small fraction of binder twine for a while and stopped; and at the time these figures were compiled there were three binder twine factories left in this Dominion—three that, in my judgment, were kept here and operated on a small scale, on such a scale that it is now described by the Minister of Agriculture as an extinguishment of the industry which, we are told, is to be recreated in this Dominion, the three being maintained so that the people of the country would not see the lesson as respects the duties on binder twine. It is because of these results of the industry, accompanied by these results to the consumer, that the government now puts its hand into the strychnine bottle and produces a little grain in the hope that they will be able to get it down with those whom they have misled for years in this House. "Yes," the Minister of Agriculture says, "We are determined this will only be temporary. Did we not adhere to that in connection with the bounties on oil? Did we not adhere to it, even against my best judgment, 'in connection with the bounties on linens and on flax?' Yes, they adhered to it and lost the linen industry, and to-day it is in process of emigration to the United States. I think the case of oil is practically the same, showing that these are not the proper methods by which to place the producer in Canada on a level with the competitor in another country; and surely common sense teaches us that unless you do that, your industry of whatever kind —be it agriculture, be it industrial, be it mercantile—it will go where it can get its best results for its investment. You have got to have conditions where you will have equal results for your investment here with those in another country, and you must continue those conditions or you will not have that industry. The government now is only bringing in this method of doing it because it has not the courage to swing right about, and do in respect of binder twine what it is doing with respect to artificial silks. I wonder whether it is right to have the "strychnine system" in connection with binder twine and —shall I call it?—the continuous and immortal arsenic system in connection with silk.

Mr. McMASTER: Both poisons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Both poisons, yes. The Minister of Agriculture chooses the medicine, apparently, according to the character of the particular applicant to the government. I hesitated somewhat to define what the test was which the Minister of Agriculture adopted, and I venture to say that if he dares to do it he will hesitate a great deal more than I do.

Mr. MILLAR: Was it not true that after a goodly number of these binder twine factories went out of existence the output of the few, at least in some years, exceeded the output from the many?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not deny that it was a fact that the output from the few, in a sporadic year or two, did, for special reasons. I knew the reasons at the time and I can give them to the hon. gentleman from memory. They were because of the excessive demand in the factories to the south, demands for special purposes far away. Those were fortuitous and exceptional circumstances. The demand for binder twine has multiplied six times since the days when the duties were removed. We are now only producing ten per cent of the demand, and the industry is in a condition where it must be given rebirth at the hands of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SALES: The right hon. leader of the Opposition has quoted an increase to 9 cents in 1899, but if my right hon. friend takes 1911 he will see that the price was 6½ cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. SALES: It has been as high as 11 cents, and even in the war year of 1915 it was 7¾ cents. If the right hon. gentleman will explain the reason for these fluctuations it might help to clear the situation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Fluctuations are inevitable, but the lowest average by far was before the duty was removed. The highest

average was after that. The fluctuations would doubtless be due to circumstances such as suggested by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). But when you get the average always higher after the duty was removed than it was before, it is pretty hard to deduce from that an argument that the removal of the duty was a great relief to the consumer.

Mr. SALES: It is equally unfair to deduce that the raise to nine cents in 1899, was due to binder twine being put on the free list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Mr. SALES: With regard to the binder twine industry as it exists to-day I had the pleasure of visiting Brantford. I know they have increased their plant from time to time. I have talked with the manager there and he does not want any protection. The right hon. leader of the Opposition smiles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You know why that was done?

Mr. SALES: I can quote the manager's own words. He said "Our industry is growing faster than we can take care of it." So that instead of being in a dying state, as the leader of the Opposition would lead us to believe, it is in a very flourishing condition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Supplying only ten per cent of the Canadian market.

Mr. MILNE: We heard from the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), about the International Harvester combine. The government at the present time 4 p.m. are maintaining a tariff wall to protect that huge combine, and yet in a very few weeks they propose spending millions of dollars to smash it. This looks to me rather like folly, but perhaps I am not viewing things in the right light. I have some figures here that might be of interest to the leader of the Opposition. I secured these figures from the Bureau of Statistics and they give the index price of certain materials. Taking 100 as the index figure for 1913 it is interesting to know that binder twine is one of the lowest, standing at 130. I will read the index price of the products of a few other industries and see where they stand. Machinery stands at 170.2; that is the index figure for 1922. Fibrous textile products stand at 140.9; building and construction materials at 165.1; binder twine at 130.5; coal oil at 125.4; hardware 186.3. These figures, it seems to me, show that the free trade product is the lowest in price compared with other commodities we have here. If the idea is to cheapen the products we have to buy, the government are taking the wrong course with respect to the binder twine industry, the profit of which is the lowest in the list of manufactured articles which I have read.

Mr. JACOBS: I was somewhat interested in the vigorous remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) when he painted this doleful picture about the passing of the twine industry by the action of the Liberal government in 1897. I should like to ascertain from him, seeing that his government was in power from 1911 to 1921, what steps that government took to correct the trouble which was brought about by the Liberal party in 1897.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We were continually being met by a free trade crusade engineered partly by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). There was only a certain amount that we were able to do. We did very well; and, moreover, through most of that time war conditions prevailed. Under those war conditions, it was impossible to recreate industries of that character in this country. I do not know what the hon. member means. Does he mean to chastise us because we kept the tariff averaging as low as we did? He is rather late in the day in commencing that course. I do not know but that on more articles than one we did keep the tariff lower than was for the ultimate benefit of the country. If I were to plead guilty to any indictment, that would be the one that I would plead guilty to, but I do not believe that plea will give much encouragement to hon. gentlemen opposite or to hon. gentlemen to my left.

The hon. member (Mr. Milne) said that there was a greater difference between the 1913 price and the 1922 price on binder twine than on most other things, although there were some exceptions. The reason for that is this. The 1913 price was exceptionally high; it was about 35 per cent higher than it was the year before. Hon. gentlemen will see at a glance what a glorious argument resulted from that on the part of the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Milne).

Mr. CAMPBELL: I fail to draw from an examination of these figures any such conclusion as that to which the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has arrived, and it appears, going over these figures from 1899 to the present time, that binder twine has not kept pace with other commodities. Let us take freights, for instance. I think transportation charges have considerably more than

doubled in the period from 1899 to the present time. Wages have probably tripled. I think about as recently as 1909, we could hire a labourer for about 20 cents an hour; in 1919, we would pay the same man 60 cents an hour. Therefore, binder twine still remained as one of the cheapest articles we have. Let us look at the matter in this way. As regards the purchasing power of money, twine is to-day cheaper or just as cheap as it was at that particular time.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) made some references to conditions obtaining in Saskatchewan, but I contend that there is no analogy between that and this kind of a bonus to an industry. I do not know that the Saskatchewan government at any time bonused any private industry. The telephone line that received a grant for organization purposes, was a purely public utility; there was nothing in it in the nature of a private concern at all. It is true that the telephone system in Saskatchewan is a joint stock company, but it is owned purely by the individual owners and users of the line.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) seems to think it is a very serious state of affairs that only 10 per cent of our twine is manufactured in this country. We might just as well say that it is a serious state of affairs that we do not raise one per cent of the bananas used in this country. Sisal hemp and manila are not indigenous to this country, and I am very doubtful whether hemp will ever be successfully manufactured into binder twine in Canada. I do not, however, think there is in this section of the House any hon. member who would not give his best wishes to this industry, and I do not think anyone in western Canada and probably in eastern Canada who does not hope that the industry will be successful. But coupled with that, there is always this fear, that if it be successful, then we shall have an annual pilgrimage to this House to demand a duty on binder twine, and the protective argument will be put up as a reason why we should have that duty. In the end, probably this will cost the farmers of the West a good deal more than they make on the hemp.

Something was said about our being dependent upon the United States, and about building up monopolies in the United States, or being in the grip of American monopolies. As regards the farmer, there is no particular difference whether he is in the grip of an American monopoly or a Canadian monopoly. I should like to know whether we are not in the grip of a boot and shoe monopoly, a textile monopoly, a farm implement monopoly, and various other monopolies that have flourished under this protective system.

Mr. McBRIDE: One hon. member on this side of the House has just made the statement that not one of the hon. members in this section will vote for this proposal. I may say there is one member—he need not be an honourable member—who will vote for it.

Mr. FIELDING: Without cutting into the interesting discussion between the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and hon. gentlemen to his left, I should like to call attention to a fallacy which ran through the whole argument of the leader of the Opposition with regard to the figures on binder twine. He appears to have assumed that on the Liberal side it was claimed that the tariff governs the price. Nobody ever proposed such a foolish thing as that. Whatever the price of binder twine was from time to time, it was by reason, not of the tariff, but of the cost of raw materials, transportation, labour. All those elements enter into the price of binder twine. It is absolutely safe to make this remark: Whether the price was low or high in any of those years, whatever it was, it would have been so much higher if the old duty of 12½ per cent had remained.

Mr. BIRD: I feel compelled to vote against both the amendment and the resolution, and in doing so I want to give a word of explanation. I voted before lunch for the bounty on copper, and that action of mine led me into a difficult situation amongst my friends on this side of the House, because they harked back to the action I took on oleomargarine the other day. They seem to have some difficulty in following the tortuous course of my actions. I do not want to enter very deeply into this discussion, except to state once more my underlying political philosophy. I think, having stated it, my course will explain itself. I am not here as a defender of any economic theory, because I realize that the people, at least my constituents, cannot live on theories. They are ordinary men and women of flesh and blood, and they have not yet acquired the habit of living under the air-bell of any economic theory. My actions are all in relationship to that view, and I want to say that if the rural dwellers of Canada do not see this yet, they are destined to see it, namely that the following of any theory, no matter how sacred it is as a theory, will not get them anywhere. It has not got them anywhere in the last

fifty years and, as I gauge the political situation at the present time, it will not get them anywhere in the next fifty. There must be a change in the attitude of mind of the rural dweller of Canada if his livelihood is to be protected, if his standard of living is to be maintained in some reasonable comparison with that of the city dweller. The rural dweller of Canada for a great many years has followed the star of free trade and at last he has fallen into the pit of political impotence; and he is destined to abide there if he cannot become practical in his political allegiance. I spoke as I did on the oleomargarine question rather out of sympathy with the dairy farmer than for any other reason, and I made the mistake of using the language of irony. But realizing the danger of that practice I warned the House in the course of my speech that I was speaking ironically. I know, of course, that such language is always double-edged, but notwithstanding my warning I found, after I had concluded my speech that I had wounded my friends more than my enemies. I am sorry for that because my sympathies were altogether with the dairyman, as I conceive him, the man who has the practical work to do on the farm in producing the milk. From that point of view I had a great deal of sympathy with his position, although I am not a dairy farmer myself, nor a representative of dairy farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BIRD: It may not be permissible for me to explain my action on that occasion, but I think it is usual in this House for hon. members to be allowed that privilege.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend not think that it is too hot an afternoon to hold any post mortem?

Mr. BIRD: I am trying to avoid that. I took my stand on that question, not as a dairyman or the representative of dairymen, but as the representative of a wheat growing section of Canada; and by no conceivable stretch of the imagination could it be considered that protection will ever benefit that part of the country. I was consistently carrying out my theory of representation when I took my stand on the question of free trade, as I did in the debate on oleomargarine. Now, with regard to my attitude towards copper. That attitude, let me say, owes something to the peculiar character of my constituency. I think I represent the only constituency in Canada that can produce both copper and hemp, and produce them equally well. With regard to copper and my vote on that question I frankly own that I made concessions to the isolated community to the north of my constituency, a community that has practically no representation in this House because it is in the minority and has no influence, to speak of, on the representation in parliament. I make that concession frankly to the people on the north side of the Nelson constituency, not with any idea that it will serve my own purposes, because I do not believe for a moment that it will. This matter of bounties contains no element of principle for me. A bounty, as I look at it, should be allowed or disallowed according to its practical bearing on the interests of the country as a whole. I am not admitting for a moment that there is any principle herein contained, and I certainly do declare that so far as my conscience is concerned my action is perfectly clear and straightforward.

With regard to hemp, on which I am reversing my vote, let me state the situation. My constituency, on its south side, is well adapted to the growing of hemp, but the farmers there, although their land will grow this product, do not look upon it as a practical proposition, so far at least as they are concerned. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) states that the north of Manitoba is not adapted to wheat growing. I want to correct him in that regard: There is no part of the west of Canada that can grow wheat to compete with that produced in the Swan River valley, comprising the south part of my constituency, and I make no exception whatsoever. It is recognized to be the best wheat growing section in the whole of the West, and there is no such thing as a crop failure in my constituency. For that reason the farmers are not interested in hemp. They believe that hemp producing would involve them in additional work in the fall of the year when attention to their crops is all-important. Moreover, they do not believe that the length of the season in the fall is sufficient for the attention which is required in the proper curing of good hemp. This is not my own opinion, for my own opinion is not concerned; I have it on the authority of a very representative body of farmers in my constituency. They do not think that there is any advantage in this bounty on hemp; if there were, I believe they would possibly be in favour of it. I know from experience that the farmer of Canada is not a theorist; he is not wedded to any theory. And why should he be?

Too long has he been misled by theoretical propositions; he has followed that will-of-the-wisp for all these years and has got nothing thereby. He has been led into the never-ending controversy on the respective merits of protection and free trade, which question has blinded him to his own interest, so that he has come out the loser. And so far as I can see he will continue to lose. I think I am representing the attitude of the farmer of western Canada when I say that he has no interest in any theory as such; I cannot conceive his being so foolish as to have any such interest. I believe he is becoming sufficiently enlightened on the economic and political questions of this country and is no longer to be fooled by mere theories. The situation of the farmer is rather suggestive of the method used in the capturing of a gamecock. They bring along a gamecock in capitivity and place it near the free bird. Presently the two become so absorbed in their mutual attentions that the owner of the captive comes along and catches them both. That is typical, I think, of the case of the Canadian farmer. The political parties have succeeded in ensnaring the farmer in the controversy between protection and free trade, and in the process the rural dweller has been deceived and has got nothing in the result. One would think that having been so badly left behind he would have learned wisdom; but the occurrences of the last few days show that the farmer of Canada has not learned wisdom yet. He has still the desire to pursue the rut which leads towards no profitable goal. In making this explanation, I hope that my hon. friends will not misunderstand me when I indulge in the somewhat dangerous practice of using a two-edged phrase, because I have no other reason for being here than to help our rural men and women receive a better proportion of the good things of life that are being produced in this wonderfully wealthy Dominion.

Mr. DICKIE: I believe the government is advocating this bounty largely for the benefit of my hon. friends to the left, and I do not see why we should spend our time this torrid afternoon trying to force the benefit on unwilling recipients. The free trade Old Man of the Sea seems to have fastened himself around the necks of my hon. friends to the left to the exclusion of vision and good judgment. I believe that the encouragement of the hemp industry will help our friends materially, but if they do not think so, why spend our time trying to force a benefit on them that they are unwilling to receive?

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GOOD: At the risk of offending those who wish to get out of this "torrid" chamber I shall venture to make a few remarks. We have had a very interesting exposition of political philosophy from my hon. friend from Nelson (Mr. Bird). I take issue with him mildly in regard to the application of what I consider to be a very sound principle. When he enunciates the welfare of the nation as the only principle worth considering in deciding between protection and free trade, I think he is on safe ground. I would suggest that if we are convinced that one policy is better than the other, always bearing in mind the common welfare, then he and I are perfectly agreed. I use the very same principle as a test of either protection or free trade, and from a fairly close study of the matter leaving aside for the time being considerations of political economy, the general policy of free trade works out very much more to the advantage of any nation adopting it than does the policy of protection. If we are going to divide ourselves into a number of classes or communities seeking something for ourselves as such, I do not know what we are coming to. Certainly I very much question the advisability of taking this position.

I regret that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is not in his seat. I think he is really too shrewd to believe half of what he said this afternoon. For instance, in reference to his quotation of the prices of binder twine, it must be obvious to him, as was partially pointed out by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), that there are many other considerations entering into the determination of price. I would add to those already enumerated by the minister that the price index, or the general price level, has to be kept in mind in any comparison of figures.

As for the competition between towns, which was referred to by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I agree with him that it is just as objectionable and just as unjustifiable as the competition between nations. I think we are prepared to admit that generally speaking such competition between communities is reprehensible. If so, I submit it calls for just as strong condemnation when indulged in between nations.

I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) ought to remember the danger of taking habit-forming drugs. In the actual working out of this policy of giving bounties, subsidies or tariff protection, we nearly always find that after we take the drug for a few years we acquire the habit, and it is almost impossible to break it off.

I believe the right hon. leader of the Opposition left a wrong impression on the House with regard to the binder twine industry. I happen to live near the Brantford binder twine factory—one of the few survivors of the 'nineties. It has been alleged that the abolition of the protective tariff on binder twine brought about a number of bankruptcies and general disaster to those engaged in the industry. I regret that I have not the detailed analysis of the situation which was made two years ago by, I think, the Toronto Star, but, speaking from memory, the actual statistics as to production will not bear out the statement made by the leader of the Opposition. If my recollection serves me, the relative production has not decreased in Canada. And the factory at Brantford has gone ahead by leaps and bounds. The management have had difficulty in keeping up with the demand for their products. It has been impossible to get a sufficient amount of capital in the industry to expand fast enough to meet the growing demand, and this in spite of the fact that they were face to face with competition from the larger binder twine industries in the States. A number of our Canadian binder twine concerns which went to pieces at the time referred to were in the promotion stage. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition looks into the statistics carefully, I think he will find that his statement is not correct, and that to speak of the binder twine industry as having been brought to an emaciated, gasping condition by the abolition of the duty in 1898 is very far from the fact.

One more thought I should like to present to him and to the House, particularly to some hon. members opposite who have perhaps some lingering belief in the gospel—shall I say?—of freer trade. If industry, speaking generally, could be stimulated by this method which we are so prone to adopt at the present time, which seems very plausible and which I notice commends itself to men like the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) and a number of his associates, including the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell),—if it could be stimulated in this way, then surely we would have had happier results for following this policy. I submit that a careful examination of the facts will show that if you stimulate one industry it can only be at the expense of some other industry, that where you build up one you tear down another, and on the average the whole result is negative rather than positive. I submit as a general principle in that connection that a mistaken public policy based on an economic fallacy must lead to disaster. As for me I am quite prepared to stand—

Mr. McMURRAY: Is it not a fact that the Brantford factory of which my hon. friend speaks so approvingly received its start under a system of protection and that when the tariff wall went down it flourished? The very illustration he gives contradicts his own argument.

Mr. GOOD: No, far from it. If I remember rightly this factory was built before the abolition of the duty in 1897.

Mr. McMURRAY: That is what I say.

Mr. GOOD: It is quite true it was built before that time, but it had a very precarious existence for some years and it was on the point of bankruptcy when the present manager took over the job. I had it from frequent conversations with him that the success of that industry has been almost wholly, if not entirely due to careful management. He has stated on more occasions than one, I think even publicly, that he and his associates have no desire for any tariff protection. The success of that factory has been marked since the abolition of the duty; prior to that time they were getting along in a very limping way. These are the facts. I simply wanted to impress this upon the committee—and I am sorry the right hon. leader of the Opposition is not here—that we have tried out this policy in Canada and the results have been disastrous. We ought therefore to pause and examine the course we have taken. Having regard to the results that have been secured from this fiscal policy, we ought to be quite certain as to the basic principles involved before we trust our future to it.

Amendment (Mr. McMaster) negatived: Yeas, 44; Nays, 81.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I

desire to present the tenth report of the select standing committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Rule 115, the rules can be suspended in cases of urgent and pressing necessity. The hon. gentleman has not made the point that there is a pressing necessity in this case.

Mr. McGIVERIN: The explanation is that to-night is the last night for private bills, and that if these bills are not placed on the order paper to-day they will have to stand over.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman has made out a case for the presentation of the report.

Mr. McGIVERIN: I beg to move:

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the tenth report of the select standing committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, the following bills be placed on the order paper for consideration in Committee of the Whole this day:

Bill No. 224 (from the Senate) for the relief of John Samuel McDonnell.

Bill No. 227 (from the Senate) for the relief of Margaret Marie Pope.

Bill No. 228 (from the Senate) for the relief of Loretta May Girard.

Bill No. 239 (from the Senate) for the relief of Herbert Hugh Keller.

Bill No. 240 (from the Senate) for the relief of Nellie May DeBlaquire.

Bill No. 229 (from the Senate) for the relief of Birdena Frances Wallace LeMay.

Motion agreed to.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1923-4

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1924, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUEBEC SAVINGS BANKS ACT, 1913, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 231, to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act, 1913.

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

On section 1—Certain charters continued.

Mr. FIELDING: There are two savings banks in the province of Quebec having charters separate and apart from the ordinary Bank Act. The purpose of this bill is to extend the charter of these two savings banks for a further period of ten years. It is the usual bill following the Bank Act.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTIES ON PETROLEUM

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 214 respecting the payment of bounties on petroleum.

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

On section 1—Bounty on petroleum.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before the bill is gone on with in detail—has my hon. friend had an opportunity of further considering this question, and of making up his mind whether it is not possible to save public revenue and at the same time keep the small well producer going by fixing a limited number of barrels beyond which the bounty would not be paid?

Mr. FIELDING: That suggestion was offered in several quarters at an early stage of the discussion and I am sorry we have not been able to concur in it. We think that the concession now made is giving all concerned an opportunity of adjusting themselves to the changed conditions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend think that the small producer can go on at all under the new conditions? Or is it a matter of indifference to him?

Mr. FIELDING: As my hon. friend asks my opinion I rather think they will go on, but my opinion is not worth as much as that of other members who are better informed, perhaps.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 187 to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

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

On section 1—Excise duty on cigarettes decreased from $7.50 to $6.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose this bill is just what it appeared to me to be—I have not had an opportunity of studying it—that it merely carries into effect what we have already discussed and what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has already explained.

Mr. FIELDING: The first part of the bill provides for a reduction in the duty on cigarettes. The latter part of the measure is in regard to the abolition of the excise duty on beet sugar.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EXPORT ACT—PULPWOOD

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance moved the second reading of Bill No. 242, to amend the Export Act.

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

On section 1—Governor in Council may by regulation prohibit export of pulpwood.

Mr. McMASTER: Before this clause is carried I wish to direct a few observations to the House. I think it was the celebrated Doctor Johnson who made the following reply when asked by his landlady as to the condition in which certain food came before him: "Madam, this meat was ill-killed, ill-dressed, ill-cooked and ill-served." Apparently it was undesirable from all points of view. And, with all respect for those who are responsible for this legislation, I have the same feeling concerning it. This is not the first time that legislation of this sort has been brought before the House during the last few years. The Protectionist and Unionist government in 1920 brought in a similar though a wider measure before the House. In the session of 1920 Sir Robert Borden moved:

> That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Customs Act, and to provide that the Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations for or relating to the exportation of any article, commodity or material which is produced or manufactured in Canada, and which is, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, necessary or desirable for the use or consumption of the Canadian people, or for the encouragement, maintenance or preservation of any trade, industry, business or occupation, and may by such regulations order and direct that any such article, commodity or material shall be exported only under license issued by the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue, or by an officer appointed upon the minister's recommendation for that purpose.

I will not read the whole resolution, but I would direct the attention of the House to what I consider very sound observations made at that time by the now Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau). After referring to this legislation he spoke as follows:

> For my part, I would like to know of some concrete cases in connection with which legislation of this kind becomes necessary in time of peace and under ordinary conditions. We complain that we have a large debt; that our currency is at a discount; that the balance of trade is against us. Now we are going to place in the hands of the government the power to restrict exports of any kind of commodity. Whatever the reason may be, I do not think that there is any emergency to call for action of that kind. Unless the special committee submit a report on the matter which changes my mind, I shall be absolutely and entirely opposed to vesting such power in the Governor in Council.

I addressed the House on the same occasion and spoke as follows:

> This proposed legislation is to my mind so vicious that I wish to have an opportunity given on the introduction of the resolution of speaking to it. It would be very well for the country to be fully advised as to what the government purpose doing. I would have thought that the Canadian nation was thoroughly sick of the government endeavouring to control industry, and it is surely bad enough to have a protectionist government in power with the right to control imports into the country, but it would be worse to have them control exports from the country.

It was on that basis that I opposed the resolution at that time. However, the resolution was referred to a special committee. That committee went into the matter. Subsequently Sir Robert Borden begged leave to withdraw the resolution and it was withdrawn on the 30th June, 1920. I commend the action of Sir Robert Borden in that connection to the present administration.

5 p.m.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in some remarks directed to this quarter of the chamber some time ago, referred to the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) having raised a little altar of his own. I admit the fact. But I would remind him that at least the fires of that altar are not fed by splinters from a broken platform. I would draw his attention to the fact that when he made those observations he stated that he was in favour of the principle of free trade, but in order to be on a level with the United States, who had placed high duties against our goods we had to place high duties against them. I will not enter into an argument as to either the soundness of the economics or the soundness of the logic contained in that statement, but I would direct the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that the United States have no duties, as far as I am aware, against exports from that country of pulpwood or any other commodity; that their desire is to further advance their foreign trade and not

to restrict it. The Golden Rule was said by Mr. Roosevelt to be not only good morality but sound politics; I think it is a particularly wise rule to follow when the other party is very much stronger and more powerful than yourself. "Do as you would be done by." This is more especially desirable when the other party is ten times more powerful than yourself. If we are to prohibit the export of pulpwood from this country what are we doing? We are inviting reprisals. I do not know whether they will come or not but we are certainly inviting them. What would the situation be supposing the United States restricted the export of hardwood from that country? What would the furniture manufacturers in western Ontario do to replace their raw material, the hardwood that is brought in from the United States? They would certainly suffer, and with them the Canadian people. How long could our cotton mills proceed to carry on their business if there was an export duty placed on cotton, or its export into Canada were restricted? They could not carry on very long.

Mr. HOEY: What about coal?

Mr. McMASTER: An hon. member asks "What about coal?" I was just going to speak of coal. The whole of central Canada is warmed in winter, generally speaking, by anthracite coal brought from the United States, and we who live in central Canada would not contemplate with any equanimity our source of supply being interfered with. Indeed, suppose the United States in reprisal adopted an embargo against degrees from American universities? What would happen in that connection, or even if invitations to address Rotarian clubs in that country were prohibited?

What influence has been at work upon the government to bring them to this frame of mind? The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) told us that the Liberal party had a frame of mind looking towards free trade. Restriction of exports is not an evidence of a frame of mind reflecting free trade. What has deflected the Liberal party from its frame of mind, according to the senior member for Halifax? Is it those gentlemen in the country whose raw material is pulpwood and who wish to be in a position to buy pulpwood cheaper because there will be fewer buyers in the market? If it is those gentlemen who think their interest will be advanced by such a restriction, they are very short-sighted and they are making a great mistake. For, what are they likely to run into? If hon. gentlemen will turn up the United States statutes, cumulative supplement of 1923, they will see on page 347 a paragraph in the American tariff which reads:

Par. 1301. Printing paper, not specially provided for one-fourth of one cent per pound and 10 per centum ad valorem: Provided, that if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall forbid or restrict in any way the exportation of (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), or impose any export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise) upon printing paper, wood pulp, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp, the President may enter into negotiations with such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government to secure the removal of such prohibition, restriction, export duty, or other export charge, and if it is not removed he may, by proclamation, declare such failure of negotiations, setting forth the facts. Thereupon, and until such prohibition, restriction, export duty, or other export charge is removed, there shall be imposed upon printing paper provided for in this paragraph, when imported either directly or indirectly from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, an additional duty of 10 per centum ad valorem and in addition thereto an amount equal to the highest export duty or other export charge imposed by such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, upon either an equal amount of printing paper or an amount of wood pulp or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp necessary to manufacture such printing paper.

That is the situation in which this country may find itself if it attempts to restrict. Surely we have had long enough in this country restriction of the right of purchase; but the modern restrictionist wishes to restrict us in the right to sell, and that may land the country in this undesirable position, that our foreign trade in regard to pulpwood may be considerably prejudiced. I think also I might call the attention of the government to this fact, that the passing or bringing into force of such legislation as this, is to ill requite the action of the American people as regards the supply of anthracite coal which we have noticed for the last few years. In this part of Canada we have had for one or two winters back a scarcity of anthracite coal, and we have found that the United States, although they were themselves suffering from a shortage, saw that Canada got its fair proportion. This is a very poor requital for their generosity in that regard.

What is the real theory, what is the real principle that one should follow in this connection as in other matters of this kind? I take it that after a Canadian citizen has grown a bushel of wheat, or manufactured a cheese, or cut a log, or cut a cord of pulpwood, he should have the right to exchange that for the very best value he can obtain, either inside or outside of this country. I see no other proper theory or principle to follow.

And this legislation, if applied, is directly contrary to that. This constitutes a bad precedent. but before I touch on the question of this precedent, let me state how this will affect people in my riding.

I do not often make appeals based on how a matter will affect people in my riding. I do not consider myself purely a mere delegate to think simply of the interests of my constituents, but I consider myself as a representative of the whole people, although I am elected from a certain constituency. In this case I believe the interest of my constituency marches on all fours with the interest of the whole country. Under this legislation a farmer in my riding who wishes to sell a certain quantity of pulpwood, let us say to Richford, Vermont, or to an American paper mill, somewhere to the south, will find himself hampered. He will not be able to get the price that he otherwise would obtain for it. That is unjust; it is not right; it is not consistent with the principles which we would have supposed would animate a party calling itself a Liberal party. It is a bad precedent. If it is right to do this, if it is right, in the interest, let us suppose, of the newsprint manufacturers to limit the right of sale of pulpwood to producers, then it is right, in the interest of the millers, to limit the right of export of the grain producers, the wheat producers. There is no limit to the application of this principle, once it is admitted. It is a most unwholesome precedent.

I had the honour to be a member of the last parliament, and I took some part in the consideration of public questions which came before that parliament and in the debates which we held. One of the strongest arguments which we used against the continuance in power of the distinguished leader of the Opposition and the group which surrounded him, was that they were too fond of trying to govern this country by orders in council. We stated that time and time again in the House, and the matter went pretty widely throughout the country. This was one of the reasons, one of the concomitant reasons which led to his defeat. Now what do we find? We find that this unwholesome practice of government by order in council is introduced in connection with this legislation; that some fine morning three months from now, if this legislation passes, the farmers may find that an order in council has been passed in Ottawa restricting their right to sell certain of their wood products to the United States.

When Clovis, one of the first of the Frankish kings was baptized into the church of the day, St. Rémi said to him: "Courbe la tête, fier Sicambre, adore ce que tu as brûlé, brûle ce que tu as adoré." "Burn what thou hast adored and adore what thou hast burned." I do not know who is the St. Rémi who has given this advice to the present administration but I do know that in this regard the present administration is doing precisely what St. Rémi advised Clovis he should do.

I may bring my remarks to a close. I do not wish to detain the committee, but I know that I am on sound Liberal ground in making the protest that I do. I cannot, however, fail to think that a picture which I see before my mind is a somewhat true picture. I see the present administration as a ship, the Prime Minister as its captain, the Minister of Finance as its first mate, and the Minister of Justice as its second mate. In accordance, it seems to me, with orders issued by the second mate, the first mate has thrown overboard the compass. It had become somewhat depolarized before it was confided to the deep. The chart has followed. The starboard watch—for "starboard" means the "steerboard," the side which controls the ship—watch the chart going down into the ocean, with their faces wreathed in smiles. The port watch do not feel quite so happy. They wonder whether it is worth while launching the life boat in order to recover the chart before it sinks into the ocean. While they are contemplating and waiting, the chart goes down, down, down! No chart, no compass! The ship without a course, without a compass, without a chart, is driven on by this wave of protectionist feeling and wind of protectionist sentiment, until it will, I am sorry to say, inevitably be shipwrecked on the rock of a hostile and, I am afraid, justly exasperated public opinion.

Mr. POWER: I wish to make just two or three remarks at this stage, since I intend to move the six months' hoist on the third reading of the bill. I simply wish to point out to the committee and to hon. members representing certain rural constituencies, that the bill as it is now submitted to the House purports to prohibit the exportation of pulpwood from all lands, the bill to be put into force by order in council at any time after publication of the regulations for four consecutive weeks in the Canada Gazette. What does this mean? It is true it has been intimated to the House by the Minister of Finance, and I think by some other speakers, that the bill will not have for effect the prohibition of the exportation of pulpwood cut from lands belonging to farmers. We have the word of the Minister of Finance to that effect and I am quite willing to take it; I believe he will stand by that promise.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say that absolutely. What I pointed out was that suggestions of that character had been offered and would be considered; but I gave no decision on the point.

Mr. POWER: That only makes my argument stronger.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps.

Mr. POWER: I am glad that the minister has made that statement. At any rate, the government promises to consider the question as to whether or not the exportation of pulpwood to the United States from lands belonging to farmers will be prohibited. I think that so long as the present government remains in power it is highly improbable that it would go the extreme lengths mentioned in the bill. But what guarantee is there that the party led by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) may not some day come into power—stranger things have happened, strange things happened yesterday—and do just what the bill proposes? If I understand rightly the views of the right hon. gentleman and those of his followers, they are pledged to prohibit absolutely and totally the exportation of pulpwood from all freehold lands in the Dominion. In what position would my hon. friends be placed who come from the border counties, such as Brome, and a number of constituencies in Quebec and Ontario where the pioneer settlers in what I might call the backwoods are obliged, in order to cultivate their lands and to eke out their existence while discharging their homestead obligations, to sell pulpwood? In what position would they find themselves if after four weeks' notice they were told that they might no longer export wood to the United States? They would find that the price of pulpwood had so diminished that it would not pay them to take it off their land. I simply warn my colleagues on both sides of the House of the results that will attend this legislation, and I sincerely hope that while there is yet time the government may decide to postpone further consideration of the bill until the commission which it proposes to appoint shall have made a full report on the matter.

Mr. GOOD: Last year, along with other members of the House, I got frequent communications from a Mr. Barnjum, who was interested in the preservation of our forest resources. I think we were all very much impressed with the representations made by him in that connection; we were impressed with the tremendous importance of preserving our forest resources against fire and damage by insects, and so on. Those communications have continued during this year, and I have noticed one rather singular and to me significant fact in connection with the very excellent representations regarding the preservation of our forest resources, namely this, that those representations usually wound up with the recommendation that, as our supply of pulpwood was rapidly being exhausted, we should prohibit its export. I have looked into these representations and I want to say briefly that so far as I can see the parties who were—I would not say, using Mr. Barnjum, although the circumstances would seem to suggest that idea—at all events, those who were interested in the prohibition of the exportation of our pulpwood apparently wanted to prevent competition from the other side. The statement was made, for instance, that we should build up the pulp industry on the north side of the St. Lawrence rather than on the south side. Well, I submit that it does not make any difference to the demands on our pulpwood whether the pulp mill is on one side of the river or the other; you will use the same amount of pulpwood. I am of the opinion, from my careful reading of the representations and the recommendation to which I have referred, that the very necessary precautions that we ought to take to preserve our forest resources have been used as a cloak for an attempt to carry out a policy intended to benefit a few pulp men in Canada by protecting them against competition for the purchase of pulpwood from the other side. That is the way I regard the situation, and I cannot but feel that the whole thing in that respect bears a sinister aspect. Let me say that I am absolutely in sympathy with every possible effort that either this government or the provincial governments may make to protect and increase our forest resources. But I consider that the proposition to prohibit the exportation of pulpwood has no connection whatsoever therewith, and that the bill now before the committee giving this power to the Governor in Council is a very dangerous and objectionable measure.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Fielding moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. POWER: I move that the word "now" be struck out and that the words "this day six months" be added after the question.

The House divided on the proposed amendment (Mr. Power), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Baxter,
Beaubien,
Bird,
Brethen,
Brown,
Campbell,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Drummond,
Elliott (Dundas),
Evans,
Fansher,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Gould,
Grimmer,
Hammell,
Hanson,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Irvine,
Jones,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
Laflamme,
Leader,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macphail,
McCrea,
McTaggart,
Millar,
Milne,
Morrison,
Neill,
Pelletier,
Power,
Pritchard,
Reed,
Robichaud,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Thurston,
Ward,
Woods,
Woodsworth—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Black (Yukon),
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Chew,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clark,
Copp,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Jelliff,
Kay,
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
McBride,
McConica,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McMurray,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Meighen,
Mitchell,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Fafard,
Fielding,
Finn,
Forrester,
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Graham,
Harris,
Hatfield,
Healy,
Hocken,
Hughes,
Jacobs,
Morin,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Preston,
Prevost,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sheard,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Vien—96.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONSTRUCTION

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the third reading of Bill No. 234, respecting the construction of Canadian National Railway Lines.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to move an amendment to this motion and to refer but very briefly indeed to the debate of yesterday on the same subject. It will be remembered that I endeavoured to show the House yesterday that heretofore all the moneys required for railway construction, capital investment, deficits, all purposes connected with our railways, were, under the practice that had prevailed, included in the estimates and consequently the country was informed each year as to just what the commitments of the nation were with respect to our railways. I endeavoured to show that in that way parliament had retained control over the annual expenditure. These were the principles that were embodied in the practice. It will be recalled that exception was taken to my statement at the time by the Minister of Finance, who stated that the estimates merely provided for deficits for such moneys as were needed for administration and operation. A somewhat sharp difference of opinion arose. I adhered to my view. Well, it is scarcely necessary to say that the facts bear me out. But I go further. The law of the land provides that; the law of the land compels it, nor did the late government ever attempt anything else. The Canadian National Railway Act in section 16 reads as follows—I shall not read it all:

> Expenses shall be paid out of the receipts and revenues. Deficits shall be payable out of Consolidated Revenue Fund.

But here is the precaution:

> In the event of a deficit occurring at any time during any fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall from time to time be payable by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Con-

solidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the amounts paid by the minister under this section to be included in the Estimates submitted to parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year; and in the event of a surplus existing at the close of any fiscal year such surplus shall be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Now as to moneys to provide for capital investment, these are covered by section 23, which reads as follows:

With the approval of the Governor in Council—

This is the section that was in question with the now celebrated Hotel Scribe:

With the approval of the Governor in Council. . . sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the company may from time to time construct and operate railway lines—

Exactly the wording of the present legislation.

—branches and extensions, or railway facilities or properties of any description in respect to the construction whereof respectively, parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure, or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities. A copy of any plan and profile made in respect of any completed railway shall be deposited with the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

And pursuant to those laws of this parliament every dollar for the purposes of the railway, whether to be raised by guarantee or advances in cash, was included in the estimates. The House will scarcely be surprised to learn that when the bill was going through in connection with the loans to the companies, although nothing else was ever intended but that the money should be each year voted by parliament, hon. gentlemen opposite rose and insisted that a clause go in compelling the submission to parliament. That submission was immediately adhered to and a clause put in, and these hon. gentlemen now, and chiefly the Prime Minister, who at page 1539 of the Hansard of 1919 railed in derision at the government for not having a clause in to provide that each year the money should be submitted in the estimates, and who declared that without it parliament would lose all its control, and who as a consequence had the clause put in, now comes to parliament with a bill and apparently is going to get the quiescent approval of this House to provide that the government does not need to put in the estimates any more the moneys advanced to the National Railways for construction purposes. This is of course a change of front, but a change of front is the invariable rule, in fact it is about the only consistent thing about the government—a change of front on every piece of legislation and policy. I for my part desire to do what we did, and did willingly, in 1919. I desire to provide for the retention by parliament of its control

[Mr. Meighen.]

year by year of the amount of the people's money that is going out that year, and I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens):

That the said bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend same so as to provide that the money or guarantees of money required for the purposes of the said bill must for each year appear in the estimates and be voted by parliament.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, that every appropriation for the public service and every obligation assumed in the name of the government of Canada shall be subject to a direct vote of the House of Commons is a principle to which we can all subscribe. But I do not agree with my hon. friend in his insistence that all items should appear in the estimates. He said, using a quotation a moment ago, that it was essential that the House should know year by year the outgo for the year. Now there is nothing in the law which my hon. friend has quoted to show that it is essential that all items shall be voted in the estimates. The essence of the law is that the moneys shall be voted by parliament, and parliament is now being asked to vote the moneys for this particular purpose. Again and again in the course of the discussion yesterday the hon. gentleman said that we were asking for a blank cheque. He magnified the situation as to how the Minister of Railways might enlarge or diminish or lengthen the mileage of the railways. In that case the essence is that a railway has to be constructed from A to B. That is the vital question. But if the mileage estimated by the engineers is sixty-two miles, and it turns out to be sixty-one or sixty-three miles, there is no vital error if you take the money that is appropriated and apply it to that purpose. There is no blank cheque so long as you state your sum and state the purpose for which it is to be voted. A railroad from A to B shall be constructed, and the sum is stated and you cannot go beyond that. Again I say, the vital question is not that the item shall appear in the estimates, but that the money shall be appropriated by a vote of parliament.

I called the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the railway subsidies involving millions of dollars have always been voted in a separate bill. He said no, and later qualified that and said perhaps—he was not sure. I am sure that these railway subsidies, and they are quite akin to what we are doing now, have again and again been submitted to this parliament by a separate vote. Therefore I see no wrong in these railways being treated separately.

There is the further point, the reason for that. Let us take as an illustration the resolution on the order paper to loan $10,000,000 to the Montreal Harbour Commission. Here is a case in which we are not going to vote the money year by year in the estimates. We are enacting a law; providing the required amount; we do not limit the harbour board to a particular sum for one year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Finance Minister permit a question which will bring the matter to a point? Will the minister tell us why it was wrong in 1919 to provide authority to the government to advance money for the construction of railways, for the National lines, and why it is right to do it by legislation in 1923?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not quite recall what happened in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have Hansard and the bill here.

Mr. FIELDING: As far as my impression is concerned I do recollect the question. However, I do not want to dwell unduly on this matter. Is it not a reasonable proposition that instead off asking for money each year provision should be made for carrying on the work continuously? These railways are not to be completed in one year, neither is the harbour of Montreal. In both cases we vote a sum estimated to be sufficient for the purpose, and if it is not expended in one year it is expended in another. In both cases parliament has given the necessary authority. All that my right hon. friend has said regarding the authority of parliament is complied with in this resolution. We have a distinct vote for a distinct purpose, we have a distinct limitation of amount, and what more can be asked? The Minister of Railways pointed out that if you limit the amount to a sum for the particular year you may stop the operations at the end of the twelve months. As long as you have designated the roads to be constructed, as long as the terminal points are indicated, as long as the amount is limited, what earthly good is to be accomplished in the month of December by telling the Minister of Railways that he must stop and not do anything more? It is not reason, it is not law, it is not common sense.

Mr. FORKE: I listened very carefully to the reading of the section of the Railway Act by the leader of the Opposition which applies, and I am forced to say that I came to the same conclusion that the Minister of Finance has just stated—there is a very specific provision that the money shall be voted by parliament. I can find nothing in the statute which requires that the money shall be voted year by year. I should just like to remark parenthetically that some very wonderful things must have been taking place in parliament in years gone by judging from the remarks we have heard from the leader of the Opposition. However, I for one am not so much interested in what was right or what was wrong in 1919. What I want to know is whether it is right or wrong to carry out what we are interested in at the present time; and I cannot see anything in the act—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the desire of the House that we should take a vote before taking recess?

Mr. FORKE: I am through.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr SPEAKER: We will proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. FORKE: I was just finishing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon gentleman.

Mr. FORKE: I can see the reasonableness of what is proposed. The railway building is to be spread over a period of three years but is to be carried on from year to year. We know how much it is going to cost, and therefore, it does not seem to me to be unreasonable to vote the money for the construction of these lines at the present time. However, I want to remain within the strict reading of the law and if the leader of the Opposition is right in his contention that what is proposed here is against the law, of course, we will bow to the decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just a word in answer to what the Minister of Finance has said. He claims that our position is not sense, is not law; I do not know how much further he went, I simply remember that much. Now, let me read what the present Prime Minister said on this subject. His words are to be found at page 1539 of Hansard for 1919. He said:

> If parliament wishes to part with the last vestige of the control that it has over the executive, we should pass this clause, but if parliament wishes to retain any control it may have over expenditures this clause should not be permitted to stand. If money is needed for the carrying on or improvement of the Grand Trunk system, let the minister come to parliament, just as the government does in regard to other appropriations that may be necessary, state in parliament what money he needs and have that money voted by parliament

I do not think it is too strong a term to say that this section is thoroughly vicious in that it deprives parliament altogether of its control over the supplies that may be necessary for this purpose. Under this term "the operation or improvement of the Grand Trunk system" the minister can spend public money for any conceivable purpose in connection with these roads, building hotels, branch lines and stations; he can go into any constituency in this Dominion where the railway is going to run and find that this particular town needs this improvement or that particular county needs that improvement—

And so on. That is what the Prime Minister thought in 1919.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There has been a change of government since then.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There has been a change of government, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A different government altogether.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The ideas my right hon. friend had when he was here are absolutely and entirely different from the ideas he holds now that he is over there. What was absolutely wrong when he was sitting here is absolutely right when he is sitting on the treasury benches. What was practically misappropriation of public funds when he was in opposition becomes a public duty entitling him to make the expenditure when he sits there as leader of the government. Of course it is a different government. That is the whole point. It is not necessary to argue this matter any further. The Prime Minister himself gives the House the answer: He was here before, he is over there now. The facts are the same. Surely they are the same to this extent at any rate: It is a first rate thing for the country as a whole, and for parliament, to know exactly what we are spending on railways, to know each twelve months where we stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that not exactly what the Minister of Railways is doing?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all, that is exactly what the minister is getting away from. We might just as well be clear on that point; there is the whole question. Previously we had to have our twelve months' programme which covered everything including deficits and construction. My hon. friend's bill this year covers construction just as it did before but we will not get the complete annual statement as we formerly did. Under the estimates parliament has got some control, but under this bill we shall have none. This policy will enable the government to do in the constituencies exactly what was foretold by the Prime Minister when he was in opposition. There are twenty-eight constituencies in which they can do practically what they like. Supposing an election comes on? I do not believe there is any prospect of an immediate election, but supposing there was?

Mr. GRAHAM: You never can tell.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Here is the very vehicle for the government's purpose, here is the bait which can be dangled here and there. Parliament has the right to know what is to be done each year and has the right to vote money for the purposes of this undertaking. But that right has gone. If parliament wants to do this all right, but let parliament clearly understand what it is doing. The customary practice, the right and proper practice is being changed and the minister will be in a position to say "I am not bound by the approximations given to parliament. The mileage of these lines are mere approximations, the amounts of money to be spent are mere approximations. I can do as I like, under those approximations, with the credit of this country."

6 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. GRAHAM: I just want to inform my hon. friend that what he has read is not consistent with this bill at all, not in the least. If he will look further into the matter, and calmly, he will find that parliament is making the appropriation, that stated amounts are to be expended every year, and that a full report must be made to parliament of the money expended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: After it is spent.

Mr. GRAHAM: Parliament then has the right to say what further shall be done and if we should overrun certain amounts parliament will have to provide for that.

Mr. STEVENS: If they are overrun.

Mr. GRAHAM: No deviation, no thwarting of the power or will of parliament, directly or indirectly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What option has parliament if the money is overrun or spent? How does parliament exercise any control after the money is spent and gone? This is the Scribe Hotel case over again.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend is raising a very small point. If everybody is dishonest, crooked, then the thing may go wrong; but if people are fairly honest, with the check of parliament, they will not go

wrong. Let me point this out. My hon. friend said that this is against the law. This bill in getting its third reading, will be the law when it passes through this House.

Mr. CALDWELL: I can see a very good reason from a logical point of view, why this amendment should not carry. Supposing we pass this amendment, each year an appropriation must be voted to carry on construction for the year. We will vote enough this year to make the surveys on these different lines. It is now fairly late in the season, and it is possible that not more than a survey will be made this year. Next year we must vote money for the construction that it is expected we shall be able to carry out during the year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Vote it this year.

Mr. CALDWELL: This means that this House will be in session until August. That is a possibility. There is also a possibility that no construction will take place next year. I am in favour of voting the three-years' programme. I am certainly in favour of this parliament voting money to carry on public works, and I can see an object in voting the supply for the three-years' programme, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to ask the Prime Minister for a word of explanation before the vote is called.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the explanation that my hon. friend wants?

Mr. GOOD: The Prime Minister has made in the past certain representations which are alleged to be inconsistent with his position to-day, and I should like some explanation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are not inconsistent. If my hon. friend will carefully read all that has been said to-day, he will find that there is no inconsistency.

The House divided on the proposed amendment (Mr. Meighen) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Baxter,	Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Black (Yukon),	Leader,
Bowen,	MacLaren,
Boys,	Maclean (York),
Church,	McMaster,
Clark,	Meighen,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Preston,
Evans,	Spence,
Grimmer,	Stansell,
Hanson,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Harris,	Sutherland,
Hocken,	Tolmie,
Irvine,	Woods,
Jones,	Woodsworth—23.

NAYS

Messrs.

Baldwin,	Laflamme,
Béland,	Lapointe,
Benoit,	Leger,
Binette,	Lovett,
Boucher,	Lovie
Bourassa,	Low,
Brethen,	Lucas,
Brown,	Macdonald (Pictou),
Bureau,	McBride,
Caldwell,	McConica,
Campbell,	McGiverin,
Cardin,	McIsaac,
Carmichael,	McKay,
Casgrain,	McMurray,
Chevrier,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Chew,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm,	Marler,
Copp,	Michaud,
Davies,	Millar,
Delisle,	Milne,
Denis (St. Denis),	Morin,
Desaulniers,	Morrison,
Desrochers,	Morrissy,
Drummond,	Motherwell,
Euler,	Munro,
Fafard,	Murdock,
Fansher,	Ouimet,
Fielding,	Papineau,
Finn,	Pelletier,
Forke,	Prevost,
Fournier,	Pritchard,
Gardiner,	Raymond,
Garland (Bow River),	Reed,
Gauvreau,	Rhéaume,
Gervais,	Rinfret,
Gordon,	Robb,
Gould,	Roberge,
Graham,	Robichaud,
Hammell,	Ross (Simcoe),
Hatfield,	St. Père,
Hopkins,	Sales,
Hughes,	Savard,
Jacobs,	Séguin,
Jelliff,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Johnston,	Speakman,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Spencer,
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Steedsman,
	Stewart (Argenteuil),
King (Huron),	Stewart (Humboldt),
King, Mackenzie (York),	Tobin,
Kyte,	Vien—101.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

(Sessional)

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messrs.	Messrs.
Logan,	Bristol,
Murphy,	Porter,
Power,	Mewburn,
Rhéaume,	LeSueur,
McKinnon,	McQuarrie,
McCrea,	Stevens,
Malcolm,	Duncan,
German,	Chaplin,
Kay,	Wilson,
Mitchell,	Manion,
Maclean (Halifax),	Guthrie,

Sinclair (Oxford),	McKillop,
Clifford,	Stansell,
Lavigueur,	Sheard,
Gendron,	Garland,
Duff,	Dickie,
Stork,	Ladner.

(Special)

Messrs.	Messrs.
Putnam,	Stewart (Leeds),
Rankin,	Bowen,
Healy,	Senn,
Martell,	Anderson,
Carruthers,	Maybee,
Forrester,	Ross,
Lapierre,	Hubbs,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	White,
King (Kootenay),	MacKelvie.

Mr. MARTELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DUFF: I was paired with the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I was paired with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion (Mr. Graham) agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at 8.30 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill 223 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jessie Anne Epstein.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 224 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Samuel McDonnell.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 226 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Conkey.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 227 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Marie Pope.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 228 (from the Senate), for the relief of Loretta May Girard.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 229 (from the Senate), for the relief of Birdena Frances Wallace LeMay.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill No. 239 (from the Senate), for the relief of Herbert Hugh Keller.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 240 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nellie May DeBlaquire.—Mr. Rankin.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SECURITIES

Hon W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Canadian National Railways Act, 1919, and to provide that no securities as defined in section 26 of the said act, including in such definition equipment certificates or obligations in any form intended to be issued to the public, shall be issued, except those approved as to form, terms and amount by the Governor in Council, and that such securities so approved may be guaranteed by His Majesty.

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

Mr. FIELDING: The purpose of this resolution is to restrict in some respects the powers of the Canadian National Railway Company. The numerous companies now comprising the Canadian National Railway system have their independent charters, under which certain borrowing powers are conferred. These charters are still outstanding; some of the borrowing powers remain unused, and if we take no action whatever it would be within the power of the Canadian National Railway Company to exercise those borrowing powers. What we propose in the first place by this resolution is that no such security shall be issued under those old borrowing powers without the consent of the Governor in Council. In the second place, where they have the lawful right to issue securities and where that issue is approved by the Governor in Council, in that case the Governor in Council shall have the power to guarantee them. It is not likely that those old borrowing powers will be very largely used, because the later legislation confers borrowing powers—both the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919 and the act with which we have been dealing today. A bond or security of any kind now issued by the Canadian National Railway Company is to all intents and purposes a bond of the government of Canada; it is desirable, therefore, that we should recognize that fact in the placing of securities. As I say, it is not anticipated that these borrowing powers will be used extensively; perhaps they will be used quite rarely if at all, but if they are used it will be only with the consent of the Governor in Council, and if bonds are to be

issued for any lawful purposes there is no reason why they should not then be guaranteed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Have any bonds of this character yet been issued?

Mr. FIELDING: They have not been issued by the Canadian National Railway Company, but the various subsidiary companies have of course issued bonds in many cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I must say I sought in vain to understand this resolution before the minister rose, and now in the light of his explanation my difficulty is enhanced. The minister says that the different companies composing the National system have by virtue of the original charters, which they held prior to the passing of the Canadian National Railway Act, certain borrowing powers, and that he wishes to curtail those borrowing powers by placing upon them a restraint, the restraint being that the forms and so forth must first be approved—

Mr. FIELDING: And the propriety.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the resolution does not say so. It simply says, "approved as to form, terms and amount." But that is not the point I am making. The restraint he intends to impose upon these constituent companies who want to issue bonds or place mortgages in pursuance of their old charter powers is that such issue or mortgage shall first have the approval of the Governor in Council, and once that approval is given the Governor in Council is to have the power of guaranteeing those bonds. Well, my first point is that the resolution does not do that at all. I hope the minister can correct me—or rather, I shall be very much interested if he can; I have not much hope. What does the resolution say? It reads:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Canadian National Railway Act, 1919, and to provide that no securities as defined in section 26 of the said act, including in such definition equipment certificates or obligations in any form intended to be issued to the public, shall be issued, except those approved as to form, terms and amount by the Governor in Council, and that such securities so approved may be guaranteed by His Majesty.

I direct the minister's attention to the fact that what he is doing is resolving to amend the Canadian National Railway Act, section 26, so as to provide that any securities issued under that section must be submitted to him. Now, what is section 26? It reads:

> The company may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, issue bonds, debentures, debenture stock, perpetual or terminable, or other securities. . . in repect of the mileage of the lines of railway which it, from time to time, constructs, acquires, owns or controls,—not including the Canadian Government Railways, nor exceeding, with outstanding securities, in the aggregate $75,000 per mile. Such securities may be issued separately in respect of one or more of the company's lines of railway or properties, or in respect of all of its lines, or properties taken together. The company may issue such securities in one or more separate series maturing at the same date or at separate dates, and bearing the same rate or different rates of interest, not exceeding in any case six per cent, and may limit the security for any series or issue to such of the franchises, property, assets, rents and revenues of the company, present or future, or both, as are described in the mortgage or mortgages made to secure such securities.

I have read it hurriedly, but does the minister catch the point? Here is a section which says the Canadian National Railway Company may issue securities, and it may issue them on the whole Canadian National Railway property or on only part of the property, but they are an issue of the Canadian National Railway Company. It is the Canadian National Railway Company that issues them and undertakes to pay. The security may be on the whole property or on only part, and the minister says it is expedient to amend that so that these securities may be submitted to the Governor in Council. Does he not see that does not affect in the least any security issued irrespective of the Canadian National Railway Act by virtue of the charter powers of one of the companies making up the composite company? It does not affect that at all. He is only touching the securities here, and the Canadian National Railway Company cannot issue a security save as it has authority to do so by the statute.

Mr. FIELDING: The old constituent companies will not issue these securities now because all their powers are transferred and consolidated with the Canadian National Railway, and therefore any securities issued would be issued by the Canadian National Railway, but we were advised that there was quite a possibility that the power outstanding would authorize the Canadian National Railway, in virtue of the consolidation of the various constituent companies, to issue securities. At all events it was thought well to make it sure that if any securities were to be issued they should be made subject to the Governor in Council. It may be that we are simply making assurance doubly sure, but the legal officers thought that such action was desirable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not struck the section yet, but I am satisfied that there is a section here already which says that all securities issued by the company shall be approved as to form and so forth by the Governor in

Council. That is in all these things. Very well, the minister has that now. It does not matter whether he has it under the old powers or not. As a matter of fact, I do not care what anyone says; it is too obvious to admit of discussion. The Canadian National Railway Company cannot issue a security unless it is authorized by the act creating the company. It is given certain powers by that act and it cannot get powers from any other company. It is created by a single act, and these powers it exercises in issuing securities are restrained already by the very terms embodied in this resolution. Consequently it seems to me the minister is not doing what he set out to do. It may be he is restraining the parent company, but he is not restraining the constituent companies at all, and my opinion is that he is not restraining anything. I will tell you what the minister is doing in this resolution. He is doing just what he did this afternoon or what his colleague to his right (Mr. Graham) did. He is just preparing another bill by which this government can guarantee the bonds of the Canadian National Railway Company and not come to parliament for a vote for the purpose.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is dreaming. There is not a shadow of foundation for that view. It may be that this is unnecessary, that we already have the power, but the idea that there is any object here of issuing any securities not authorized by parliament is entirely mistaken. All the rights, powers and privileges of the constituent companies I think have been transferred and consolidated in the Canadian National Railway Company. It has been thought expedient to retain all these rights, powers and privileges, but it has been held and with some force that inasmuch as all these rights, powers and privileges have been transferred and consolidated with the Canadian National Railway Company it might have power to issue securities under the borrowing powers of these constituent companies. The most that can be said is that this bill may be unnecessary. There may be something in that view, but the idea that there is any object of issuing securities not authorized by parliament is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will just see. The Canadian National Railway Company cannot take powers from these other companies. It has not the power to take them. There is no power save what is here. Secondly, the other companies cannot give the powers to them. A federal railway like the Canadian Northern —all of them are federal railways that are in the act, under the provisions of the British North America Act—not one of these can transfer its powers save with the consent of parliament. They cannot do it. The Canadian National Railway Company to-day has not any of the powers of these subsidiairy companies except as given to it by this act. To my mind this is pure surplusage. In fact I must say I think it is merely an attempt to cover up the real purpose of this resolution. The minister says, not without the consent of parliament. That is all right. But what he is going to do is to bring down a bill to enable guarantees to be given on the Canadian Northern securities, and once he gets that bill through he can go right ahead guaranteeing them and giving the credit of this country, and he does not need to include the amount in the estimates. Now we will watch his bill.

Mr. FIELDING: We do not need to include the amount in the estimates, but we would in the proper appropriation. If my hon. friend finds in this some mysterious deep-laid scheme I can only come to the conclusion that he has allowed his intense partisanship to lead him astray. There is not a shadow of foundation for anything of the sort. It may be surplusage. It does not create any power, but if there is an existing power to issue securities of the Canadian National Railway then this says that if they are lawful securities the Governor in Council may guarantee them. It may be that my hon. friend is right and that this is covered by the act of 1919. He may be correct in that view, and if he simply argues that this legislation is unnecessary and that we have covered it already that is worthy of consideration. But when he imagines there is some deep-laid diabolical scheme to guarantee something and give the government new powers I can only hope that he will not always see these mysteries in the common things of life. If he takes the view that it is covered by existing legislation, that view is entitled to respect, but I hope he is not going to base any argument on the foolish assumption that there is some dark, deep-laid scheme behind this legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not describe it at all. I simply said it was a scheme. I have not said it is unnecessary for the two objects the minister has in mind. I say it is unnecessary for the first, and that takes up most of the verbiage. It is necessary for the second object, to give the minister and the government power to guarantee without the authority of parliament in the estimates. It is

necessary for that, and that is the real object of this resolution, and that is going
9 p.m. to be the bill when it comes down. I ask the House to wait and see.

Mr. FIELDING: I will bring in the bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 244, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act, 1919.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

FINANCE ACT, 1904—EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. That the Minister of Finance may make advances to the chartered banks and to the savings banks to which the Quebec Savings Bank Act, 1913, applies by the issue of Dominion notes upon the pledge of certain securities, such advances to be repayable within one year with interest at such rate as may be from time to time fixed by the treasury board.

2. That the provisions of the proclamation dated 3rd September, 1914, made under the authority of the Finance Act, 1914, so far as they authorize the chartered banks to make payments in their notes instead of in gold or Dominion notes, and so far as they suspend the redemption in gold of Dominion notes be continued in force for a period not exceeding three years after the date of the coming into force of any enactment founded on this resolution; provided that the Governor in Council by proclamation may declare and proclaim an earlier date for the termination of any enactment which may be founded on this resolution; and

3. That the Governor in Council during a period not exceeding three years after the date of the coming into force of any enactment founded on this resolution may by proclamation from time to time and for any period or periods declare and proclaim that the export of gold coin, gold bullion and fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada shall be prohibited except in such cases as may be deemed desirable by the Minister of Finance and under licenses to be issued by him; provided that the Governor in Council by proclamation may declare and proclaim an earlier date for the termination of any enactment which may be founded on this resolution.

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

Mr. FIELDING: The object of this resolution, Mr. Chairman, is to renew what is called the Finance Act of 1914. That is the act under which the government are authorized to make advances to banks as against certain securities. The act was adopted as a war measure, and no doubt was exceedingly useful in the financial operations during the war. It may be said that the war being over we no longer have any need for the act, but experience has shown that the act is still required; indeed, I am inclined to think that something of the kind will have to become almost a permanent part of our financial system. Under the act as it stands to-day, the act as passed some years ago, the government are authorized to advance to the various chartered banks, and to the banks mentioned in the act, sums of money as against certain securities not specified but left to the judgment of the treasury board. Any securities of which the treasury board may approve can be accepted for the purpose, and the government can make advances against them. This resolution, and the bill to be founded thereon, simply renews the act but is a little more specific: Instead of leaving the whole matter to the treasury board the resolution and the bill will indicate the classes of securities upon which advances should be made. The securities of the higher class beyond all question are acceptable. Then we come to the class of securities as to which there may be more room for question. We do not need any particular advice or consultation respecting the standing of the higher class of securities—the high class Imperial government securities, the Dominion, provincial and municipal securities; but there is also a class included in the general expression of what I may call commercial securities. Therein comes a little trouble. My impression is that when the act was passed it was hardly contemplated that these commercial securities should be used; I think the act was designed to serve another purpose. But there is no machinery in the Finance department for making inquiries into the character of securities of that class. As I said a moment ago we do not need any machinery to know the value of certain high class securities such as Dominion and provincial securities, or high class municipal securities, we can all easily ascertain the value of these; but when we come to what are called commercial securities, commercial paper and securities like that, machinery for determining their value does not exist. I am inclined to think, although that is a mere matter of opinion, that originally it was not intended that these securities should be used in a large way. However, they are to-day a part of our financial system and there is a growing feeling, perhaps, that there should be some method of rediscounting such as this act provides for. Having in view that class of securities we aim at seeking the advice of somebody who is competent to advise. As I stated before, we have no organized machinery in the Finance department for that purpose, and we

are proposing in this bill that the gentlemen who are trustees of what is called the Central Gold Reserve institution—which was pretty much discussed in the Banking and Commerce committee—shall be deemed an advisory committee and that we shall have the right to ask their advice. They are not to control the matter, but we may at any time ask their advice as to the character of securities that are offered. Again I say we do not need their advice in the case of the higher class of securities; but if some of the banks were to ask us to make advances against ordinary commercial securities it might be desirable that we should have some means of making inquiry into the character of those securities. As the best available means we propose to ask the gentlemen who represent the government and the banks as trustees for the Central Gold Reserve. We regard them practically as an advisory committee from whom we may seek advice if it be needed.

Another portion of the bill relates to the proclamations by which the export of gold is forbidden. We propose, for the present, to continue the powers to prohibit the export of gold, with the addition that if at any moment it may be deemed necessary, that power can be waived and the export of gold continued. These are the main features of the resolution and of the bill which is to be founded upon it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend is absolutely right in continuing the operation of the War Finance Act. It is something that has proved its value time and time again, and I know that the minister needs it to-day in order to keep commerce going upon a proper basis. In connection with the origin of the act it is, I think, quite true that the securities mainly looked upon as securities likely to be offered were not only our own and provincial securities but other first class securities which became available during the war period, namely, the certificates and notes of the Imperial government against which many loans were made. But besides that there was a very direct object, and that object was the discounting of paper covering the wheat movement. That, of course, is really just as good a security as any of these other securities. We only lend to a proportion of the whole amount covered in these wheat and flour transactions, and we are protected by the usual bills of lading, warehouse receipts, insurance and the like. I hope my hon. friend is not, through any advisory committee, seeking to curtail the activities under the act having regard to the movement of the wheat crop. I think I am perfectly within the mark in telling the committee that we never had a loss in connection with the operations under the act. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that we have had some pretty bad times to go through in connection with the war, and the deflation period after the war. But we have had no losses and, speaking frankly, I do not think any very great difficulties. I desire to see the minister doing nothing which removes direct government supervision and control of the extension of these credits. I do not know why the act is necessary at all to deal with the question of an advisory committee. If my hon. friend, in the discharge of the office, thinks he has to get advice it is always open to him to get it, but I think the responsibility always lies with the department—

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —as to either the granting or the refusal of credit. I repeat, this is a resolution which I think ought to be adopted, and I hope that the main object will be kept clearly in view—that this is a government function with government responsibility.

Mr. FIELDING: I entirely concur in what my hon. friend has said. The government cannot and do not desire to absolve themselves of responsibility and if my hon. friend will look at the bill—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not seen the bill yet.

Mr. FIELDING: —he will find that special reference is made there to the class of securities that are regarded as favourable:

> Promissory notes and bills of exchange secured by documentary title to wheat, oats, rye, barley, corn, buckwheat, flax or other commodity;

Then the bill goes on to say:

> Promissory notes and bills of exchange issued or drawn for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes and which have been used or are to be used for such purposes.

It is not intended for a single moment that the government shall absolve themselves of any responsibility, but they may need information as to that class of securities.

As I stated before, we have in the department no organized machinery to deal with them. All the power we take is this. I will give an illustration. Supposing a bank offered us some security which might be of a very

good character, but of which we had not the knowledge. Of course anybody in a business way can ascertain the value of securities of the higher class; but if securities of a less substantial character were offered, it might be desirable that we should get some information as to their character. We have thought that these four bankers in Montreal could be for that purpose an advisory committee. That does not mean that they are to have any responsibility or that we evade responsibility. It means that if we need information as to the particular class of security, we do not know of any better authority from whom we can ask information than the gentlemen indicated. They do not have the responsibility. We have the responsibility and must take it. This is merely a precaution in the case of a possible offering of a certain class of securities, which may be all right but concerning which we require information. Otherwise, I agree entirely with the hon. member for West York that the object is just as he has described it, and our purpose is not to restrict the business which is being done under this measure.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is it not a fact that what the minister proposes to do is already being done in the United States by the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank system, and that all these things are being done there? There is absolute need of a similar institution in this country. For the first time the minister has admitted the need of something of that kind in Canada. I have in my hand a memorandum—

An hon. MEMBER: Read it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have no intention of reading it, but I will send the Minister of Finance a copy. It gives the details of the splendid machinery that has been created in the United States for this very purpose. This is not exactly in the hands of the banks; but it is in the hands of the government; they take charge of it, and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury department are all parties to it. They discount great quantities of prime paper for the banks for all kinds of organizations; the banks get this money at a very low rate of interest, and they are in a position to increase the amount available that they can offer to the public also at a low rate of interest. If we adopt something like that, we have a first class system to deal with the question, and to reduce the rate of interest to the country on the prime securities of the country. This is being done in England, and almost every country is gradually coming to this system. All the evidence now is, that the National Reserve Bank system of the United States is an absolute necessity for that country; that it secures discounts for everybody entitled to them at a low rate of interest, and that national notes take largely the place of bank notes, in order to give this credit to the country.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no doubt this measure serves to some extent the same purpose as the national reserve system of the United States. But as we are not likely at this session to adopt the national reserve system generally, we might have this bill as a piece of it, possibly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The national reserve system was a thing that was very carefully considered, and it has not cost a great deal of money. Running it in the way we ran it before—and I think my hon. friend will probably continue to run it in the same way—the cost to the country is practically nothing; there has been just a little more clerical work to be done. On the question of interest, it may be interesting to the committee to know that during the whole of the war period at the time these things were being done, the rate of interest which was charged to Canadian customers, varied from 1 to 1½ and sometimes as much as 2 per cent less than the same charge being exacted by American banks. The whole thing was done cheaply.

Mr. MILLAR: What is the basis on which the amount of these advances is decided? Would a weak financial condition of a bank, it being therefore much in need, be a factor? If so, how would it operate? Would it tend to increase the advance or to lessen it?

Mr. FIELDING: There is a margin of safety, but at the moment I have forgotten what it is. We make a safe reserve in that respect. We do not advance the full face value, but I cannot tell my hon. friend offhand what proportion we keep. I think that answers the first question. As regards the second question, if a bank is in a weak position, a hasty judgment might be that we should not have anything to do with it. But if the bank has good securities, an advance might help the bank to get into a good position. Everything depends upon the character of the securities. Therefore, a weak bank, if it had strong securities, would be entitled to the benefit of the act.

Mr. LUCAS: I understand there is no limit to the advances, provided that banks hold the necessary securities.

Mr. FIELDING: That is substantially correct.

Mr. LUCAS: What rate of interest is charged to banks?

Mr. FIELDING: Five per cent. It may interest the committee to know the extent to which this act was availed of. Beginning with 1914, advances to the banks amounted to about $12,500,000. They ran up in November, 1917, to as high as $56,000,000; in November, 1918, to $115,000,000; in November, 1919, to $112,000,000, and in November, 1920, to $123,000,000. Since that date they have fallen, and at this date advances under the act are a little less than $7,000,000. The government have from time to time received interest on these advances, and interest alone down to the present time amounts to over $14,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And it is practically all profit.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 245, to supplement the Finance Act, 1914.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

Mr. Fielding moved the second reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD: Are copies of the bill available?

Mr. FIELDING: I will send my hon. friend my copy. If there is any objection, I do not wish to press for the third reading; but this is a purely formal matter, and what has been stated in the House covers it exactly.

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

The CHAIRMAN: As this bill has not been generally distributed, if it is the pleasure of the committee, I will read the clauses.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

On section 13—Paragraphs (b) and (d) of proclamation of 3rd September, 1914, continued in force for three years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Paragraphs (a) and (c) are omitted. What do they refer to?

Mr. FIELDING: My notes are not here and I cannot answer offhand. If my hon. friend thinks it important I can send him a memorandum.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can probably find out in the meantime.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—Repeal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose section 15 deals with a matter covered by the new section 14?

Mr. FIELDING: I think that is likely the case.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I believe it is; in other words, it is made a little more permanent than in the existing statute.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

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

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Before the motion for the third reading is carried I desire again to enter my protest, as I did in the Banking committee, against the substitution of bank notes for national notes. There is no reason why the banks, when the accommodation is afforded them, should use their own notes instead of the national notes they take from the government as issued by the Dominion of Canada. Those notes are issued in twos, fours and other denominations, but the moment we give the accommodation to the banks they substitute their own notes for circulation. When an advance is made to the banks national notes are given and they should use those notes in the conduct of their business. But they say for advertising purposes they wish to substitute their own notes for the national notes. This cannot be justified, it is time it came to an end, and I hope that when we get a national reserve banking system all the business will be done with national notes instead of bank notes.

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

CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 216 to amend the Customs Tariff Act 1907.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On section 3—Schedule A amended.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I presume we can take it for granted that the sections carry out in each particular the resolutions already discussed?

Mr. FIELDING: I assure my hon. friend that that is correct.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 230 to amend the Special War Revenue Act 1915.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On section 1—Stamp tax on cheques, etc.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When this bill was first before us I drew my hon. friend's attention to the way in which the tax on receipts was being evaded by specially drawn cheques and bills. At that time my hon. friend pointed out, as was perfectly true, that there are always evasions of every law, but that this was no reason why the tax should be abolished. Of course, my hon. friend found evasions in the past, but not of an act introduced by him. However, I will not go into that matter. I merely ask if he has made provision in this bill to prevent such evasions.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, we hope the regulations that may be framed will cover the point suggested by my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should think that would have to be done by statute, or by giving statutory powers.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will read section 3 he will see that what he is referring to is covered. He may be sure that we are anxious to profit by his suggestions to avoid evasions. Might I say regarding the bill generally, that there is one feature as respects which an amendment is found on the order paper to-day. I think most other matters contained in the bill have already been discussed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the bill in which is contained the sales tax in its latest form?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. The resolution on the order paper to-day really gives the final word on the subject as I hope it will be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only reason it is final, I suppose, is because the session is closing.

Mr. FIELDING: There are two or three days yet, you know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister be good enough to tell us what this last change really does? As far as I can make out it simply reverses the second last change. Why does he not reverse it openly instead of by this most circuitous phraseology?

Mr. FIELDING: There is nothing circuitous about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know who drafted this, but it does seem too bad that we have to put the legislation in this form. The phrasing is anything but clear.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The material change is this. In the resolutions as they stood prior to this amendment we contemplated imposing a sales tax upon imports. The advantage of that was that we would certainly get the money and get it at the beginning. It was contemplated that the tax should be paid, for example, by the importer at the beginning and after he had passed the goods on to the manufacturer he would be entitled to refund, because we would then follow the goods into the manufactory and get the tax at the final stage. That would work out, in a way, successfully from the point of view of the government, but it was urged that it would impose a considerable burden on business men; that where large transactions were being carried on, the necessity for financing to meet the additional duties required would be a serious matter. But perhaps even more serious was the representation that in making arrangements for the refund there would be considerable trouble. After full consideration and hearing the many conflicting views on the subject we came to the conclusion that we would not insist upon the payment of the tax at the time of the importation of the goods; that if the importer sold the goods to a licensed manufacturer there need be no tax paid at that stage; we would follow the goods into the hands of the licensed manufacturer and on his completing the transaction and producing something to be sold the tax would be levied then. I think the change that is made is fairly acceptable—I will not say universally acceptable, because no system of taxation can come under that category. But I am quite sure that although there are differences of opinion on the subject, this form is the most acceptable to the business people.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Have the business men expressed their view in the matter?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I have heard from all sorts and conditions of business men.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have been receiving telegrams from them, and I would like to know whether this amendment in some measure meets their presentation of the case.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it does.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did complain and do still about the way this has been done. I doubt if there are three hon. members of this House who know what they are doing right now. I do not, and what is more I doubt whether the minister himself does. The tortuous career of this sales tax and its hopeless involutions would baffle the intellect of anybody. The minister took a sales tax that was simple, that was working all right, and he not only piled conditions on it but he kept changing and shifting and backing and filling, and finally placed the whole incidence of the tax on the importer. Other features were changed, but as to that feature the next change was the provision in some way that the importer should pay the tax first and that there should then be some rebate system when the goods reached the ultimate manufacturer. It is the latter that is being repealed, as I grasp it, by this legislation; that is to say, the final circle the minister traversed is being retraversed backwards. What are we to do? The minister says it is all right; that it is acceptable, but what does it mean? This is the proviso we are adding now; I will read it:

Provided that the consumption or sales tax specified in this section shall not be payable on goods exported; or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale and which are articles subject to the consumption or sales tax, or on goods imported by a licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale and which are articles subject to the consumption or sales tax; or on goods imported by a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for under the provisions of subsection (7); or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for under the provisions of subsection seven of this section.

Well, what is left? Something may be left, but I do not know what it is. Why not simply say that in respect of importations to be used in manufacture there shall not be a tax levied until the manufacture reaches its final state? But if it is impossible to do it that way—I know how simple it is until you get into the details—why not tabulate these exceptions so that they will be clear to the mind? If they were tabulated alphabetically, assuming it is essential that we go into all these matters in order to get back to where we were, the thing might be a little more easily understood. In fact, it is hopelessly involved legislation, and I fancy the working out of it is going to be involved. Indeed, I question whether the minister is going to put this legislation into effect. It is to be deferred until the first of January of next year. Well, his conduct last year was similar with respect to that beet tax; he finally did not put it into effect at all. And when he puts into effect a six per cent sales tax levied at the source and faces the ultimate result of his conduct, I should not wonder if he would quail before it. But if he intends to put it into effect surely it is possible not only to arrive at what we are finally legislating by a direct and immediate route but to express it in clear language. We have arrived at this stage by all sorts of marches forward, marches back, marches in and marches out and up and down; why, it is almost worthy of the Minister of Agriculture and his oleomargarine record. And if the business man finally knows what his position in the matter is—well, I do not think many hon. members of this House do.

Mr. FIELDING: There is one point on which my right hon. friend is certainly wrong. He said we took the simple tax that existed and changed it into this incomprehensible thing. I can assure him that the form of the tax was not simple; it was the subject of a great deal of discussion and a great deal of objection. The tax was payable at several stages, something at one stage and something at another. It was a new question, no doubt the ministers in charge of it made an earnest effort to make it simple, but as a matter of fact it was not simple. As to the proposed change, while it may cause a little friction at the beginning, as all new taxes do, I believe in the end it should work out well. There are good reasons for delay in putting the tax into effect, reasons based on the convenience of business men. I assure my right hon. friend that his judgment is hurried in regard to the drafting. The drafting of measures of this kind is always done under the advice of officials of experience, not only in general drafting but in the administration of customs laws, and I would yield to their judgment rather than to my own so far as the drafting is concerned. This drafting which my right hon. friend thinks is unwise has been well considered; we are advised by those most competent that it will serve its purpose. The delay is justified by good business reasons, and I have no doubt that if we are both spared to come here in a subsequent session my right hon. friend will find the tax in operation and I hope it will be working smoothly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister was told the same thing when he made the last change

imposing the tax on the importer. He was advised that it would work smoothly, but it was so obviously impractical and unsound that I do not know what kind of advisers the minister has. Why, it immediately raised a storm all over the Dominion, and the minister at once surrendered. I do not know which change this is as to number. After this I think we ought to pay no attention to the first three or four or five budgets but wait until we get the sixth and then deal with it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have received protests from business men against the tax as it now exists. The net result probably of this is that we are adopting a rather vicious principle, and if we are going to have a deferred sale tax the first thing we know there will be an agitation in the country for deferred customs duties. That would lead us to a condition of affairs that would be very annoying, and instead of securing revenue for the government it would postpone the payment until it gets right down to the consumer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would really like to understand something about this. As to the first tax I do not know that there was very much difficulty about that as soon as it got going, and I never heard of any difficulty as to just what the law meant. There was a tax on the manufacturer and a tax on the wholesaler. There was a tax on the retailer and so far as the first law itself was concerned when we had it down in the low brackets there was very little of it passed on to the public, in fact, nothing was passed on at all. But what my hon. friend has done in this case, and if I am wrong he will tell me, is simply to adopt Mr. Tinling's paper. Mr. Tinling really is the author of this tax. Mr. Tinling worked out the percentages. He has a tax of six per cent that he works out himself, then he has another tax of 6½ or 7 per cent. The whole thing has been worked out entirely for my hon. friend by Mr. Tinling. As I understood the first suggestion it was briefly something like this, that we have a consumption or sales tax of six per cent on the sales price of all goods produced or manufactured, and that the tax be paid by the producer or manufacturer at the time of the sale by him. That was the broad principle we started with. I was not here the other day when the sales tax discussion was on, but there is a question which is immediately provoked right at the commencement of our consideration which perhaps my hon. friend has covered already. We have been to some extent getting away from the intermediary distributor. Quite a number of producers now sell directly to retailers. There is always a difference in price between what is sold to the retailer and what is sold to the jobber. I think it would be fair to say that what would be sold to the jobber at 80, taking that for the sake of illustration, would be sold to the retailer at 100 approximately. What is my hon. friend going to do having regard to this tax being imposed as it is at the source? Is the tax to be paid on the 80, which would be the value of the article as sold to the jobber, and which would make a tax of $4.80, or will there be another tax on the same article when sold to the retailer, based of course upon the higher price? If that is done it is going to throw out the trade lists between the jobbers and the retailers, where you would have a tax on the same article in the first instance of $4.80 and of $6 in the second instance. Before going on I would like my hon. friend to tell me if that point has been considered, and what will be the stand taken by the department.

Mr. FIELDING: I can assure my hon. friend that there are many questions that he can ask as to interpretation which I should hesitate to answer because I quite understand that it is a matter where a difference of opinion may easily arise. Section 19BBB I am advised meets the point my hon. friend raises. It reads:

> In addition to any duty or tax that may be payable under this part, or any other statute or law, there shall be imposed, levied and collected a consumption or sales tax of six per cent on the sale place of all goods produced or manufactured in Canada, including the amount of excise duties when the goods are sold in bond, which tax shall be payable by the producer or manufacturer at the time of the sale thereof by him; and in the case of imported goods the like tax upon the duty paid value of the goods imported payable by the importer or transferee who takes the goods out of bond for consumption at the time when the goods are imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption.
>
> For the purpose of calculating the amount of the consumption or sales tax, "sale price" shall mean the price before any amount payable in respect of the consumption or sales tax is added thereto.

I think that covers the point raised by my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh no, my hon. friend's adviser has not got the point at all, and it is something which would occur to any business man right at the very commencement of his consideration of this tax. I am right in saying that you have sales of the same article to jobbers on the one hand and to retailers on the other. I know I am also right in saying that you have your regular trade lists, and to keep faith with the jobber

on the one hand and the retailer on the other certain margins are maintained. Now let me go over it again because the minister evidently did not catch my point at all. We will assume that the sale price to the jobber is 80, and the sale price to the retailer 100. On the face of it, it would appear that the tax on the article when sold to the jobber is to be $4.80, and when sold to the retailer $6. Now that is going to throw out the alignment at once. What my hon. friend so far has not told me and what I want to know is if that same article is going to bear different sales taxes or not.

Mr. FIELDING: If they have different prices I should think the tax could be levied on the actual selling price. The minister has in this case as in the case of the customs law a very general power to deal with any question of valuation, but it is a very intricate matter and I would rather not attempt to interpret the act. If there be any room for doubt in the matter I would have it inquired into, but I would not give my hon. friend a definite answer to his questions because it is quite possible there is room for a difference of opinion as to the interpretation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would have thought it would have occurred to anyone before we put new legislation on the books that we should have some idea of how it is going to work out, and the point I have raised is the very first thing that occurs to the business man. What is going to happen in connection with his lists? It is not a question of varying prices. The prices are stable, they are the same. You have your jobbers' lists and you have your retailers' lists. Now if my hon. friend is going to say that he is going to charge a different sales tax rate when sold to the retailer as compared with the rate when sold to the jobber it simply means that he is putting still further difficulties in the way of cutting out any intermediaries and cutting down the cost of distribution. If it be that in addition to getting lower trade prices, which the jobber always gets, he is going to pay on the same article a lower sales tax than the retailer, then of course the government is certainly not helping the retailer who desires to buy directly.

Mr. FIELDING: It appears to me that the selling price in each case would determine the tax, but if any peculiar circumstances arise which make the matter one of difficulty there is a clause here giving the minister power to determine the value for taxation purposes. It reads:

> Whenever goods are manufactured or produced in Canada under such circumstances or conditions as render it difficult to determine the value thereof for the consumption or sales tax because,—
>
> (a) a lease of such goods or the right of using the same but not the right of property therein is sold or given; or,
>
> (b) such goods having a royalty imposed thereon, the royalty is uncertain, or is not from other causes a reliable means of estimating the value of the goods; or,
>
> (c) such goods are manufactured by contract for labour only and not including the value of the goods that enter into the same, or under any other unusual or peculiar manner or conditions; or,
>
> (d) such goods are for use by the manufacturer or producer and not for sale
>
> the minister may determine the value for the tax under this act.

In other words whenever any of these difficulties arise that my hon. friend has in mind, the minister has the power of fixing the valuation on which the tax shall be levied.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister having read those paragraphs will surely agree that the case I mentioned has not been touched at all. There is not a single provision in the cases read by the minister himself where any case such as I have just given him could be considered. I have not given him complex cases but the easiest ones that could possibly arise in the administration of the act, a matter of every day business, whether we are to have two sales taxes on the same standard article or not. We have not had a single thing even suggested one way or the other as to what is to happen. It is on a par, I suppose, with the general miasma which seems to surround this new proposal. We cannot get the facts in connection with the first case so let us take the next one: Manufacturers or producers of over $10,000 annually are to be licensed. I take it from that, and I want the minister to interrupt me if I am wrong, that the fact of this licensing would enable these manufacturers or producers originally, if licensed, to import without the payment of any fee in advance? They are bonded and the like.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, that is quite right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought probably that would be the idea. That being so there was no difficulty created under subsection 1 of section 3 as originally brought down. I take it that the whole difficulty, and my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong, arose in connection with the subsequent resolution which he submitted. Am I right in that?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know any stage of the matter in which there were not difficulties and objections.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I want to get to an understanding of where we are now. If my leader is not able to understand the matter I cannot blame him. No difficulty has arisen as I see it—if there has I want to be informed—under subsection 1 of section 3 which provides for a manufacturer or producer of goods to the value of over $10,000 annually being licensed.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct; he is licensed now

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That being so, what is the difficulty that has arisen in connection with my hon. friend's last suggested amendment?

Mr. FIELDING: I thought I stated the objections that were raised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They could not be raised under this as I read it.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend's statement reminds me of the old story of the man who said "They cannot put me in gaol but I am there."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think there must have been another amendment brought down when I was away.

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): We are dealing with section 1 which refers to the stamp tax on cheques.

Mr. FIELDING: No, we are on the sales tax.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fielding suggested an amendment to line twenty of section 1.

Mr. FIELDING: That is to the section dealing with stamps.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know how we got into discussion on the sales tax, but we are certainly into it.

Mr. FIELDING: We had better keep on the sales tax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we had probably better keep on it. Then, in connection with the same idea, there is the regulation as to the amount that will be in the hands of the minister. I suppose that would be the Minister of—?

Mr. FIELDING: Customs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be in the hands of the minister to direct any other manufacturer or producer although doing less than $10,000 worth to take out a license?

Mr. FIELDING:) (Reading):

> If the minister determines that any manufacturer or producer, who does not manufacture or produce goods to the value of ten thousand dollars a year, uses a substantial portion of goods which are exempt from the tax in the manufacture of goods which are liable to the tax, as to which the minister's finding shall be conclusive, such manufacturer or producer shall take out a license as required by subsection six of this section and shall be subject to the same conditions as a licensed manufacturer or producer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the effect of that will be to place it entirely in the hands of the Minister of Customs to say just how many people doing a business under $10,000 shall or shall not pay a sales tax. Am I right?

Mr. FIELDING: Well, the power of the minister is certainly very considerable, but he can only apply the act as it reads. I do not think it admits of the minister exercising any power in a manner unjust to any of them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me that we have in the first place, a declaration, that people have to be licensed to do a certain amount of business. Then we have a declaration in the next instance that the manufacturers of goods, which when sold are liable to sales tax, will have to take out this license when the minister says so. As it is now left, it is a matter entirely for the Customs department to say whether a man doing a business under $10,000 is to pay or not. The minister may select any one he chooses.

Mr. FIELDING: Under the conditions set forth here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What conditions?

Mr. FIELDING: I have just read them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is simply to this extent: using goods exempt from the sales tax. That might be construed in one instance to apply to use of goods to the extent of one per cent and in another instance to the use of goods to the extent of 50 per cent. The minister might say "I do not care to apply it to this particular trade, I am going to apply it to that trade." The whole thing is wide open. It is more than order in council taxation, it is taxation by the minister himself, just as he wants to tax in connection with all these smaller matters.

Mr. GERMAN: Are we on section 6 of this bill?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): We started out on section 1 but we have jumped to section 6.

Mr. GERMAN: I have received a large number of telegrams and communications from manufacturers in the Niagara district referring to this sales tax. I am anxious to have the bill discussed section by section, and explanations given by the minister, so that we may explain the matter to the people whom we represent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have to get an understanding of the idea first.

Mr. GERMAN: The way to understand a bill is to take it section by section. If we are on section 6 let us take it first, and see to what extent it goes and whether there is anything in that particular section which is against the public interest. I do not see anything myself in that section but we shall never get anywhere if all sections are discussed together in a hotch potch sort of way. We have to read the whole bill from beginning to end in order to understand it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not want to make any suggestion to my hon. friend as to the course to be pursued. I found the general discussion proceeding on the sales tax and I continued it. We certainly will have a general discussion of this tax on some section of the bill. It was suggested by the Minister of Finance we might just as well go on with it now. It is a matter of indifference to me.

Mr. FIELDING: We have drifted into a discussion of the sales tax, and having entered upon it I see no reason why we should not dispose of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That seems to me to be proper, too. There is another thing that we should like to get a little more light on in order to enable us to understand the clause. There is a provision that:

> A wholesaler or jobber who sells not less than 50 per cent of his total sales of goods to a licensed manufacturer or producer. . . . may be granted an annual license.

It is a matter of importance to the wholesaler or jobber to be able to get his license. The minister will see that he has to carry the interest on the payment he has to make. In the first instance, he has a right to his accounts and the like. How are we going to ascertain whether a man is really doing a business of not less than 50 per cent of his total sales to licensed manufacturers or producers? If we do that, and he sells 50 per cent of his sales this month to his licensees and he sells none next month to his licensees, is his license to stop? Is anything going to be done to see that there is continuity in this? What is the idea of the clause? Why should we have it at all?

Mr. FIELDING: In all these matters, regulations will be made by the minister. I quite admit that the bill is a very complicated one, and it requires very careful study. There is something in the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite that even after we have carefully studied the matter, it is full of trouble. All I can say is that the regulations of the department will cover most of these things, and they will be made intelligently and reasonably with a view of meeting the public desire.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the idea of the change from the old basis to this?

Mr. FIELDING: The old basis was a varied rate of sales tax, and this is a straight 6 per cent tax. That is the main point of difference. The other point of difference was as regards the proposals, and I think it is concerning that that hon. gentlemen have received telegrams recently. The proposal was to put a tax on imports. It was held that while that might possibly be a convenience to the government in getting the money from that source, it was imposing burdens on the business man who would have to finance in order to provide the tax. It was represented, and I think truly, that in many large organizations, materials have to be ordered far in advance of their use. They have to be held, and it was contended that if these business men, having large stocks on hand awaiting the moment to be used, had to finance for paying interest and to carry all the stock at the same time, that in itself was going to be a serious burden. I thought there was force in the contention. There was further a provision that when an importer paid the tax and the goods afterwards went into a manufacturing concern, there would be a refund, and it was held that keeping of accounts for this would be a troublesome thing. For these reasons we have abandoned putting the tax on the importer at first, and we have provided that the importer shall not pay the tax if he sells to a licensed manufacturer. The goods will be brought into the licensed factory, and ultimately we shall get the tax when the licensed manufacturer produces something to sell. That is the main point of difference that perhaps the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) had in mind.

Mr. HOCKEN: There is one feature of this sales tax to which I should like to direct

the attention of the minister, something a little more concrete than what we have been getting for the last hour. The committee will remember that a resolution was passed unanimously that some consideration should be given to publishers of magazines and periodical literature. I should like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that instead of giving any relief to that particular industry, he has increased the sales tax from 2¼ to 6 per cent. That is just about the last straw that breaks the camel's back. Would it not be possible for the minister to do what he promised us when he brought down the budget originally, that is to say, to remove the sales tax from the newsprint and paper that go into magazines and such publications? That particular industry is in a very desperate state, and it is undoubtedly the case that a magazine could be taken from Toronto or Montreal and published at Buffalo at a lower cost than it could be published at in Canada. I am informed on very good authority that the managers of the largest magazine that we have in Canada are contemplating that particular move. It would not be a very admirable spectacle for the people of Canada to see magazine publishers forced into the United States because of the difficulties and embarrassments that are placed upon them by the laws of this country. Is it too late for the Minister of Finance to revert to his original proposal and to remove the sales tax from the paper and, indeed, from all the materials of magazines? That is a fair proposition. They are paying taxes now; they are paying duty on their art work, on their inks, on everything that goes into the manufacture of magazines and periodical literature. The minister would be well advised if he took that step, and it would be popular throughout the country if he would give that much consideration to the publishing interests. The enormous increase in the cost of production of daily newspapers has caused a great deal of embarrassment, so much that hundreds of daily newspapers have been compelled to suspend publication. Add that feature of the matter to magazines and periodical literature, and I think the case calls for some consideration by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING: The matter to which the hon. gentlemen refers, arose at an earlier stage of the session on a motion which he himself made and which produced an interesting debate. I think it had reference at the time entirely to the customs duty on American periodicals. While there was much to be said in favour of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, there is another side of the question, and we have reason to believe that public opinion on the whole would not favour it. I admit the position of publishers of magazines and periodicals is rather a hard one, but the question of the sales tax is quite a different matter. Magazines and newspapers are now exempt from the sales tax.

Mr. HOCKEN: Are they exempted on their raw materials?

Mr. FIELDING: On the thing they produce. They do not produce raw materials; they produce newspapers and magazines, and they are exempted from the sales tax, while other industries have not that benefit. The raw materials, the newsprint and paper will be produced by the owners of the mills, the paper companies, and they will pay the tax. It is laid down as a principle that with very rare exceptions, all taxes will get down to the ultimate consumer, although you may evade this for a while. In this case, however, the tax is paid by the manufacturer of paper, and not by the publisher, who becomes a seller of magazines, or a seller of newspapers, and who is exempted from the sales tax on those. Of course, it may be said that the paper company passes the sales tax on to the publisher, and I have no doubt that is the case. It would be very pleasant for the Minister of Finance if he could exempt many more things; but I do not think any strong case has been made for the exemption of print and paper; at all events, that was the view which I was obliged to take.

Mr. HOCKEN: I should like to point out to the minister that the ultimate consumer does not pay this tax, and that it has to be absorbed, not by the papermaker, nor by the ultimate consumer, but by the publisher. When the publisher buys the paper and the sales tax is paid, that sales tax is added to the price of his paper. There can be no doubt about that. It is impossible for the publisher to increase the price of his magazine, and at the same time to get any sale for it. Consequently he has to absorb that extra three and three-quarters per cent in addition to contending against conditions that are already so onerous that it is almost impossible for him to stay in business. This is not like any other industry. If a man is making boots, or anything else, he can pass the tax on to the ultimate consumer; but a man producing a publication of the kind I am describing cannot pass it on. This sales tax is putting an extra burden of three and three-quarters per cent upon the publishing industry instead of giving the relief pleaded for, not only by myself, but by a large number of hon.

members, including the Acting Chairman himself (Mr. Marcil). I thought, from the case made out by that hon. gentleman, that we should get that relief, but instead of that there is an added burden. That is the ground of my objection. We have been compelled to accept what the minister says: There cannot be any duty on magazines or on the advertising in magazines. But having accepted that, it is pretty hard now to have the sales tax increased 3¾ per cent on the raw materials that go into the product, which increase must be absorbed, representing in many cases the difference between solvency and insolvency, or perhaps between the publication of the Canadian magazine in Canada, and in the United States. I still think that the minister should look at this matter sympathetically. I believe he realises that there should be some relief in this direction; in fact I think he has said so. Surely then it is not too late to exempt these publications from the tax on their raw materials. At least do not increase the tax; keep it where it was. Do not add any burden to the industry if you cannot give it the relief for which it asks.

Sir HENY DRAYTON: The minister does not say anything.

Mr. FIELDING: What do you expect me to say?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought that at least the minister would give us an expression of sympathy if nothing else. I wonder whether he does not yet realize the fact that it is impossible for him to expect this country to carry on in competition with the outside competitor when we have here special heavy burdens thrown upon the producer by a system of taxation to which the outsider is not subject. There was absolutely no answer made by anyone to the figures quoted by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) when the matter was brought up. There was no dispute about the question; we had the exact facts and figures showing that the business was labouring under a disability. Surely my hon. friend sees perfectly well that when he says that the Canadian magazine must pay a 6 per cent tax on its raw materials, which the American competitor does not pay, he is adding very materially to the burdens of the Canadian publishing business. As I have said before, when discussing this sales tax, I do not believe in a large number of exemptions. My hon. friend must get the money and he has to get it from as broad a field as he can find. I have never urged exemptions upon him, for I think that possibly our list of exemptions

to-day is too broad and perhaps the minister has erred in enlarging it. But a very real wrong is done when we get away from the underlying principle of the sales tax. I was responsible for the institution of that tax here and certainly, as I understand it, the underlying principle was that it should be of such a character that its incidence would be so small as, on the one hand, to place no great hardship on business, and on the other render it probable that the tax would not be passed along to the general consuming public. My hon. friend must unquestionably realise that when he gets the tax up to 6 per cent he is losing sight of all that and imposing a burden which is affecting every one of our producers. Let us take my hon. friend's authority in this matter, Mr. Tinling. Mr. Tinling shows that the result of this tax is that the original charge of $6 on a hundred becomes a charge of $11.25. This matter is of sufficient importance to justify some discussion and I will point out to my hon. friend again that in the first instance, under the sales tax of the former government before it received the 50 per cent boost which the hon. gentleman gave it, much of the tax was never passed on. It did not directly add to the cost of living. I gave one or two quotations from the representations of the people that have been importuning my hon. friend to have this change made, namely, the people in business who were anxious to pass on to the consumer 100 per cent of the tax, plus their profits, and I will give one or two other questions. The thing really is so clear that there is no room for argument about it at all. I will take the case of the Wholesale Grocers' Association, whose secretary, Mr. Pyke, was interviewed in connection with the budget.

Mr. VIEN: Where is the hon. member about to quote from?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: From the issue of the Canadian Grocer, published on the 18th May of this year. Most of the references contained in it constitute a song or praise in connection with the change in the sales tax. Why? Because these gentlemen in business are now in a position to pass on to the consumer 100 per cent of the tax. We will see what this gentleman says; and let us remember that he represents a wholesale trade that were specially marked as people who had to pay the old sales tax.

"Yes, the sales tax as it was formerly collected was very satisfactory to us," Mr. Pyke replied. "However, we were told that this could not be arranged to suit every branch of the trade, and that a sales tax collected at the source was after all the best solution.

It seems to meet with the approval of manufacturer, wholesaler and retailer alike, and prior to the last budget brought down by Sir Henry Drayton, this association suggested such a method of collection, but he did not see fit to meet the proposal. Consequently when there was no other alternative, but to abide by the plan of collection from manufacturer to wholesaler and from wholesaler to retailer; then we entered into an arrangement with a large number of manufacturers selling to us, whereby they absorbed it."

The tax never passed on at all. Then taking the stand of the retail grocers, Mr. D. A. Clark, President of the Ontario Branch of the Retail Merchants' Association, says:

Sometimes it was exceedingly difficult for retailer to get back the 2¼ per cent he paid the wholesaler, with the result that retail profits suffered considerably.

And here is the considered opinion of the magazine itself:

But the change in the sales tax collection system seems to be appreciated by most of the trade. The retailers generally like it; the wholesalers are not antagonistic and it follows the proposal of a good many manufacturers who feel now that those who sell direct will be on equal terms with the wholesaler who formerly showed only 2¼ per cent to the retailer, whereas this manufacturer's invoice showed 4½ per cent.

The 2¼ and 4½ per cent were of course brought about by my hon. friend.

Many manufacturers selling through the wholesale trade absorbed the 2¼ per cent, but 6 per cent is too much and will have to be passed on.

Now, to show there is not a single note out of unison in the whole chorus, Mr. Tinling says:

That contrary to the intention of the government and to the wording of the Sales Tax Act, all the sales tax paid on an article cannot be and is not passed on to be paid by the public who are the ultimate consumers.

It never was the intention of the former government that it should be passed on. The tax was low and was arranged in such a way in the bill that it could be left off.

Mr. FIELDING: Somebody had to pay it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course, somebody had to, but the manufacturers were absorbing it.

Mr. JACOBS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend laughs. I will give authorities for my statement.

Mr. JACOBS: What did the manufacturers do with it, absorb it into their system or pass it on?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend may have some confidential advice in regard to the matter, I do not know. This is what the authority—and it is an authority that has been accepted by this government, because the plan is exactly the plan of Mr. Tinling—says:

That because of the wording and the operating of the act, some manufacturers and the majority of the wholesale and retail trade have been forced to absorb the greater part and in many instances the whole of the sales tax, which has entailed losses aggregating, it is estimated, to about $80,000,000 for these three branches of the trade.

Then he gives details of how it is brought about, and he shows how beautifully it works out when the whole of this tax can be passed on. He shows that the jobbers' profit is 25 per cent—I think he is wrong in his figures, I do not believe it is quite as bad as shown here because the retail profits are not as high—but he shows the jobber's profit is 25 per cent, the retailer's 50 per cent. Starting with the six dollar tax on a hundred dollars, the jobber's profit at 25 per cent is $1.50, making $7.50; the retailer's profit of 50 per cent on that is $3.75, making a resultant cost to the public, as shown by the author of this plan, of $11.25 to collect a six dollar tax. Obviously, my hon. friend has not had an opportunity of getting at the bottom of this thing, for he could not answer an elementary question dealing with it only half an hour ago. He will find difficulties without end in connection with it. Just take this one feature. My hon. friend realizing that this is a tremendous tax on industry provides for refunds of all previous taxes. My hon. friend will find when he goes into a warehouse for the purpose of getting at what these refunds are that the tax has gone into the stock, it is not kept in a little box for each special purchase at such-and-such a price. I do not know how my hon. friend is going to find out what those refunds are to commence with. I am sure ample opportunity is being offered there for the bleeding of my hon. friend's department in refunds. There will be practically no check at all. There might be some check if we had constant prices, but we have varying prices right through the year. I think my hon. friend is going to find it something interminable to get at, something very expensive to the country and something impossible to enforce equitably. I hope he will take power to himself to hold up the whole proposition.

Mr. GERMAN: Did I understand the minister to say that the tax upon the duty-paid value of goods is amended so that the duty is not paid when the goods are immediately taken out of bond?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend will find the amendment on page 4 of the order paper.

Mr. BAXTER: I desire to call the attention of the minister to some matters in regard to which I have received communications. One of them I think he has had under consideration, and perhaps there is to be some change in respect to it. I refer to lumber. Messrs. Haley Bros. Limited, of St. John, write me as follows:

Dear Sir,

Our attention has been drawn to the following provisions in the new sales tax plans as amended May 23, 1923, as follows:

"(7) A refund of the amount of the said consumption or sales tax may be granted in the following cases,—

(b) To a licensed manufacturer in respect of goods on hand on the 1st of January, 1924, and which are to be used in the production of articles for sale, no refund to be allowed in respect of goods on hand after the 31st of March, 1924."

This provision regarding refund is going to be a hardship to a great many concerns such as ourselves, who have to carry a considerable quantity of material through the winter months, a great deal of which will not be sold until the following fall.

All the lumber which we would normally have on hand January 1st, and on which we have paid a 3 per cent sales tax, it would be possible to sell but a small proportion before March 31st, and we would therefore ask you to have this provision removed if possible, or at least the date of same moved forward for six months instead of three as stated in the clause.

Looking at the marginal note it says:

No deduction after 31st May 1924.

But the text reads the 30th day of June, 1924. I understood that the minister had in mind making some concession in this respect, and I should like to know what may be done. I would further call his attention to the increase from 4½ to 6 per cent on lumber. If it were in reference to lumber exported, I do not know that we would have very much to say.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no tax on exports.

Mr. BAXTER: I would not have very much to say if it were a tax on exports, but when we consider that this is a tax upon lumber which enters very largely into the construction of our houses, it becomes very much more serious. This parliament granted for several years considerable assistance, through the vehicle of the provincial governments, for the building of houses. I do not know whether the scheme produced all the results that were expected or not, but undoubtedly there was a good deal of expenditure in most, if not all, of the province. But to-day a man is face to face with the question of erecting his own dwelling. Lumber enters very largely into that and the tax must fall upon the man who intends to create a home for himself. It is worth while, perhaps, to consider the possibility of letting this tax stand at the old figure. I know the minister is faced with the question of raising revenue; on the other hand the housing problem is very acute especially in our cities. In order that I shall not take up further time later I will direct the attention of the minister to a telegram which I received—I assume he has received similar representations from an important brush manufacturing industry near the city of St. John. These are people who are not unwilling to pay taxes, who want to pay their just share, and I am sure that any objections that they make are put forward not with any idea of embarrassing the administration, but entirely to point out the practical difficulties that would be raised in their business. They say:

As applied to the brush industry it is unworkable due to the impossibility of tracing the identity of proposed sales tax on raw material through to the manufactured goods. The clerical effort alone necessary to implement this proposal would add to the cost, and the uncertainty of the refunds obtainable would make an addition to our selling price imperative in self protection. The proposal will inevitably increase the cost of goods to the consumer and any gain to the government will be more than offset by the cost of the army of clerks necessary to handle refund claims.

I have other telegrams and letters from people in the lumber business, but the minister no doubt has received these representations and many others besides. The gentleman who sends me that telegram with reference to the brush industry presents his case in a very few lines and I would ask the minister's most careful and favourable consideration for the facts put forward by these respective parties.

Mr. MEWBURN: Before the minister replies I would like to corroborate what the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) has said. I think we have all received numerous telegrams; I have something like twenty telegrams here from various manufacturing industries throughout Ontario, one of which is a brush industry in Hamilton, similar to the one the hon. member for St. John has just referred to. I have representations also from the Westinghouse Company, and I would like to mention in this connection the case of Dominion Canners. They are large importers of tin plate which they use in the manufacture of cans at their can plant. Their requirements in a year would probably approximate anywhere between a million and a million and a half dollars. To tie up six per cent of this is to deal with no inconsiderable sum, especially

when the cans require to remain in their warehouses for a year or two years, or even longer, according to the size of the pack and the conditions of trade. I need not go into the details; I understand that the minister has on the order paper a resolution which is in the shape of an amendment to section 6 of the sales tax bill which will probably meet many of these cases. If so, I do not suppose there is any necessity of my taking up the time of the committee in arguing the twenty or thirty cases I have before me, which are all of the same character.

Mr. FIELDING: All taxes produce criticism. The chief complaint reaching me, however, has been the proposal to tax imports and the argument advanced, as set forth in the communication referred to by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), is that large stocks of goods have to be carried on hand and that the financing involved is a very serious matter. Then the further question is raised in connection with the difficulty involved in the matter of refund. These difficulties are covered by the amendment which I propose to move. With regard to the points mentioned by the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter), only in part can we give relief there. The former tax on lumber was 3 per cent. These various taxes pyramided; you had some imposed at one stage and some at another, and it can be shown by actual transactions that in some of these cases where there was nominally a small tax, the actual tax after it had passed from one stage to another was much higher than 6 per cent. In the case of lumber they paid a special tax of 3 per cent, and I frankly admit they will have to pay now a tax of 6 per cent. I cannot help that; somebody has to get hurt in the matter and I cannot see why lumber should be exempted. No business is very prosperous in Canada to-day, but certainly lumber is not less prosperous than the others; the price of lumber is high and the lumber industry is perhaps well able to bear the burden. The suggestion of the hon. member for St. John City with regard to the date at which some of these things should come into force has, I think, been met, but as to the main question—if it is the main question—namely, that the tax on lumber has been increased from 3 to 6 per cent, I do not see how we can promise any relief on that score. It would be most agreeable to the Minister of Finance if he could make a list of exemptions. Somebody has to get hurt in the readjustment of these taxes. In the end I do not think we shall get much more money; in fact, I am not aiming at that; the object is to simplify the tax, and if in the end we get any more money, it will not be very much. I think it will be found in a good many cases that the people will pay a smaller tax than they paid before. In regard to housing, there is some force in the suggestions made. If the lumber is imported it can be passed to the manufacturer without the immediate imposition of a tax, but when the lumber is produced at home a tax will have to be paid. That is to say, the saw mill men, those who produce the lumber, will pay the tax; I have no doubt that they will pass it on—although some hon. gentlemen have sought to show that these taxes are not passed on—to the contractor, and the contractor will pass it on to the house builder. But I am afraid we cannot help that. Several hon. gentlemen have spoken to me about the telegrams they have been receiving during the last few days, and I think the main difficulty complained of there on this question of the taxing of imports is fully met by the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion has been proceeding on section 6, but section 1 has not yet been passed.

Mr. FIELDING: I have taken the committee into a discussion of section 6, and I suggest that it be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN: With the consent of the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On this matter of the tax on the lumbermen, which the minister has glossed over so gently and respecting which his heart is much moved because the lumberman has to pay, I just wish to say a word or two. The minister has not increased the tax on lumber from 3 to 6 per cent; he has increased it from 2 to 6 per cent. That is what the minister has done in his seventeen months of power. When he came into power there was a lumber sales tax of 2 per cent, because what we use everywhere in Canada for building purposes is our own lumber; and there was no pyramiding allowed—none whatever. The act was as clear as day. It said:

> Provided that in respect of lumber an excise tax of 2 per cent shall be imposed, levied and collected on sales and deliveries by the Canadian manufacturer and of 3 per cent on importations, and that no further excise tax shall be payable on re-sale.

That was the law when the minister came into office, and when that law was put on the statute book, hon. gentlemen who are now members of this government headed by the present Prime Minister—in this respect the

present Minister of Trade and Commerce was the chief spokesman—denounced the administration for putting a 2 per cent tax on lumber—bewailed the fate of the pioneer, bewailed the fate of the farmer, bewailed the fate of the house builder, to the acclamations of hon. gentlemen of the Progressive party at the time, and called upon us to take the tax off as impossible for the pioneer to bear. And this committee sits quiescent while the present Minister of Finance imposes a tax of 6 per cent on lumber and allows profits on the 6 per cent—profits to the lumber dealer as against the contractor and to the contractor as against the consumer. This the minister has done because, he says, we have to get the money. Well, the House is faced to-night, two or three or four days before prorogation, with a set of estimates almost as big as the estimates that were produced in the middle of the session—estimates, page after page of them, that we ought to have had before us for weeks, even for months, before prorogation. I would like the minister to tell wherein the history of Canada estimates of that magnitude were ever brought down in the last week of the session. Occasionally there would be a single page and that would be all, and there would be a row over that. The members of the present government would then be screaming about the idea of bringing even that much before the House in the dying days of the session. It is unspeakable that this House should be presented with the estimates we are presented with now, running into I do not know how many pages; I have not counted them but it looks like nineteen or twenty pages of estimates entering into new votes and all kinds of votes, increasing salaries here, there and everywhere. Here is presented a second estimate almost equal to the first when we are only three or four days before prorogation, and the minister says we have to tax the settler six per cent on lumber to pay for this. He calls it a tax on the lumberman when it is not a tax on the lumberman at all. He cannot help but pass on a tax of six per cent. If it is a small tax much of it cannot be passed on, but when it is a large tax of six per cent all of it is passed. The minister has increased the tax on lumber three hundred per cent, and that is what he has done in respect of many other things. In many other lines he has doubled the tax to the consumer, but in respect of lumber, which is a staple article and has many claims to be within the exemptions, he trebles the tax and then he pleads he has to have the money for purposes of estimates like this presented to the House just three or four days before we prorogue. Has the minister wholly lost control of his colleagues? His colleagues are completely running away with the treasury when estimates like these are brought down. I cannot believe the minister is exercising the functions of the Minister of Finance when he allows his colleagues to present to parliament estimates of this character right on the eve of adjournment. Here is $14,711,000 in addition to supplementaries of $5,800,000. We have supplementaries already amounting to over $20,000,000—

Mr. FIELDING: Not for this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had supplementary estimates for last year, then we have this year five and a half milion dollars for the bonus and now $14,711,000. Here is over $20,000,000 of supplementary estimates presented just as we are preparing to prorogue. Is that really taking care of the finances of this country? Is that exercising any check whatever? What consideration can be given to these estimates now?

Mr. FIELDING: I think we will discuss the estimates when they come before the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We cannot discuss them.

Mr. FIELDING: When my hon. friend says the estimates are unprecedented and so forth, as usual he is making rash statements.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING: He will find that there are many precedents as to the time at which they are presented. I rather sympathize with the hon. gentleman in that respect. I think perhaps they should have been down earlier and that part of his criticism I will not resent, but when he says they are prodigiously large I would reply that they are not unusually large. Last year our supplementary estimates were about $15,000,000, and I do not know that my hon. friend thought we were extravagant then. But we will come to the estimates at a later moment.

On the question of lumber, again I say there is a readjustment of taxation. I am reminded of a saying of Sir John A. Macdonald in days gone by that there would be "readjustment and no increase." This is a readjustment of taxation. Somebody has to pay more and others will pay less, because the aim is not to get a large increase in revenue. I am sorry we cannot relieve them, but I cannot see any good reason why we should exempt lumber from taxation altogether or impose a lower rate than we have imposed

on other lines of goods. It would be agreeable to me if I could concur in that view, but notwithstanding my hon. friend's observations we need the money. The estimates we can discuss at another time.

Mr. EULER: I have no desire to delay the committee but I would like to be perfectly clear as to the effect of the resolution as it appears on page 4 of the order paper. I think the intention when the budget speech was delivered was that there should be no tax on raw materials coming into this country. That I think was varied by the resolution introduced on the 25th of this month, where six per cent was to be collected on the raw materials and was to be refunded to the manufacturer when the goods were manufactured and actually sold. There were a great many protests with regard to that. I had a great many telegrams and letters myself protesting against it, and the minister has reconsidered the objections, which I need not repeat. I would like to ask: Does the resolution as it appears on the order paper actually in effect remove the objection that has been made with regard to the tax on raw materials?

11 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case of imports, yes.

Mr. EULER: That is what I referred to. The manufacturers who protested to me were in the main satisfied with the original budget proposals. I would like to ask whether the resolution as it appears here restores in effect the original proposal as made by the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: Substantially yes, but if the importer sells his goods to a licensed manufacturer no tax is paid under the amendment I now propose, but the goods are followed into the hands of the licensed manufacturer and he ultimately pays. The importer whom it was proposed to tax is not taxed by this resolution.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to ask what the minister means by licensed manufacturer? Do I understand that under this new system manufacturers will have to take out a new license?

Mr. FIELDING: Most of the manufacturers of the country are now licensed under the sales tax system.

Mr. HOCKEN: The minister has not intimated whether he is going to afford any relief from the sales tax to magazine publishers. Is there any hope of us getting any relief for that particular industry?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not like to give my hon. friend an assurance that I might not be able to carry out. Under the act the Governor in Council has power to add to the list of exemptions, but I do not want to give the assurance that that will be done. The representations my hon. friend and others have made in the matter will receive the best consideration. There are, of course, two sides to the question, but sometimes we can only see one side. My hon. friend presented one side of the magazine question, but there is another side, and we believe there was a strong manifestation of public opinion against the course proposed. I do not want to give my hon. friend any guarantee. I would like to be able to give them something because my sympathies are with them, but I must not give an assurance lest I cannot fulfil it.

Mr. HOCKEN: Just as to the strength of that sympathy the minister has for my proposal I would ask him to consider the position of those engaged in that particular industry. An appeal was made in this House, and it received sympathy from all sides. A resolution was passed unanimously that some encouragement should be given to that particular industry.

Mr. EULER: Is my hon. friend making a plea on behalf of the newspaper publishers as well as the magazine publishers?

Mr. HOCKEN: No, for the publishers of magazines and periodical literature. The men engaged in that industry had a right to expect from the resolution that carried unanimously in this House that they would get some relief. The minister could not see his way clear to putting a tax either on the advertising or on magazines but later he brought down his budget, and I just want to fix this in the mind of the minister so that his sympathies will be strengthened. He brought down his budget and the magazine publishers saw some relief. They were going to be exempt from the sales tax of 2½ per cent. Well, that was something but before they got to the end of it that exemption was withdrawn, and instead of a sales tax of 2½ per cent there is now a sales tax of 6 per cent, so that as compared with the original budget announcement this particular industry is now suffering under an increase of six per cent, and that is what I want to fasten in the mind of the minister if he will allow me. Under the original budget proposals they were exempt from the sales tax, but now they have a sales tax of six per cent. That is too heavy, Mr. Chairman, and I think the minister, feeling as he does, ought to endeavour to bring his colleagues and the Governor in Council around to the view that this exemption should be added to those already in force.

Mr. MILLAR: I should not like this bill to pass without a protest on my part. I suppose it is hopeless to look for any change, but certainly what is proposed under this measure seems to be a very heavy tax that will fall upon the consumer. The increase is very great, and I notice that a great deal of discussion centres around, and seems to depend on whether it can be passed on or not. Not enough consideration has been given to those who are to pay the tax after it is passed on. I listened with care to the words of the leader of the Opposition and I took a note of their purport. I feel that I concur, and must do so, in what he has said in regard to expenditure. In fact after looking over the supplementary estimates that have just been brought down—I am sorry to say this but I feel bound to do so—it does look to me as if the ministers seem to be tumbling over each other to see how they can spend the money. When I look at the long list of items representing the expenditures that has been made in building or repairing harbour improvements or wharves, and when I refer to the further lengthy list of proposed expenditures which has come down, and then think of the vast expenditure in regard to other matters, to say nothing of the increase in the salaries of the deputies, I think that during the two sessions I have spent here I never felt as hopeless as I do to-night. Something has been heard already in this House in regard to the secession of the western part of Canada from the rest of the Dominion. I have always discouraged that idea, and I hope I shall always be able to do so, but if this expenditure goes on, I shall not be able to discourage it with the same fervour and feeling which have influenced me in the past. When you think of the industries that are languishing, and that are being starved to death; when you think of the suffering on the prairies—I know that hon. members do not like to hear this but I feel that I am discharging my duty when I bring this again to the attention of the government—when you think of the manner in which many families have been living—it is no exaggeration to say that in some cases the children have been clothed in sacks; that I believe is an absolute fact—when you think that many started farming years ago and have worked hard for the last three years but are poorer now than they were, without any bad luck; when you think of all these things and then look over the estimates that have been brought down, personally I cannot help but feel discouraged and I must protest against this lavish expenditure and the heaping up of burdens on those who are least able to bear them.

[Mr. Hocken.]

Mr. FIELDING: I think I will have to suggest to my hon. friend that he discuss the estimates on their merits. Each of these items will have to be considered and if there is no good reason in their favour they will have to be dropped. If there are good reasons for them my hon. friend no doubt will admit their propriety. However, we both agree this is not a good moment for discussing estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister tell us how in the world we can discuss these estimates? The notice is out for prorogation this week. The discussion of these estimates is a mere farce which may have been intended by the government who brought them down at this stage.

Mr. FIELDING: I hope my hon. friend is not taking part in a farce. I should like him to feel that he was discussing matters of a serious character; but if he feels that he is doing anything farcical I regret it very much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister knows it is a farce.

Mr. CHISHOLM: It was always thus.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): It seems to me that what is proposed is going to impose a hardship on a great many of our industries. I have received quite a number of communications from large manufacturing concerns in my riding with regard to this taxation and their chief objection is that it will tie up great sums of money that they need in their business. As I understand it this tax is to be applied on goods imported. After the goods have been manufactured and resold this sum of money is to be given back to the firms in the shape of a rebate. Now, I have in my constituency a firm doing the business of wood-working, a firm known as the Victoria Wheel Works. This firm import nearly all their material. That is to say all the hickory and white oak which they use in the manufacture of their wheels, spokes, and so on is imported; they cannot get this material in Canada. Now, they claim that if this tax is imposed they will be subjected to very great hardship and inconvenience because they have a large amount of money tied up in the sales tax and consequently are out of money to that extent. Another objection which I find is quite common is this. It will involve a great amount

of extra book-keeping and no small amount of extra work in order to preserve the identity of these taxes. There will be considerable expense involved, and the objection, to my mind, on that score seems to be well sustained. I should like to ask the minister if the amendment which he has proposed will cover these points?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I can assure my hon. friend that the case he has just mentioned is entirely covered by the amendment before the House. He is all right.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: There is just one comment I should like to make on this proposition. I have always been a believer in direct taxation because I thought it was the fairest and most economical form of taxation; in studying out the details of this bill and considering the objections which have been advanced during the discussion I am certainly very much strengthened in my opinion. I do not like this tax. I am not going to discuss it at any length because I know it is futile, but I should like to say this: I do not like it for two or three reasons. One is the inevitable pyramiding which this form of taxation involves. It is absolutely correct, as stated, that the tax will approximate 10 or 11 per cent by the time it is paid by the consumer. That means that the men who pay the taxes actually pay about double the amount the treasury receives, and to my mind it is a rotten form of taxation, if you will excuse the expression. I am not worrying about the manufacturers; I have always found they are very well able to look after themselves. The man I am worrying about is the poor fellow at the other end who finally has to pay the bill. To the manufacturer it is simply a matter of some inconvenience, of, perhaps, extra book-keeping, and of the tying up of a sum of money for a little time. Eventually the tax is passed on, and the ultimate consumer pays it. He is the man I am worrying about. I should not like this opportunity to pass without repeating the protest I have made before against this form of taxation. I do make the appeal to the Finance Minister to consider the matter and see whether he cannot do away, to as great an extent as possible, with this indirect taxation upon commodities which is bound to bear with peculiar hardship upon the consumer by its pyramiding, by the fact that it is not based upon a man's ability to pay but upon the amount of goods he requires to purchase, and must increase in direct ratio to the number of dependents he has in his family. It is not a fair basis of taxation at all, and I hope the time will come when the Minister of Finance, the government, and parliament will see their way clear to adopting some direct system of taxation as a result of which a greater proportion of the money obtained will find its way to the treasury, a taxation which will be based upon a man's ability to pay and will meet the necessities of the case.

Section as amended agreed to.

On Section 3—Exemption for stamp tax on receipts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where has the minister got all this from? I have not noticed it before. I suppose this is practically the manner in which the act is to be enforced.

Mr. FIELDING: This is taken from the English act, I am advised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it all taken from the English act?

Mr. FIELDING: Practically, I am advised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any machinery thought out as to how this is going to be enforced?

Mr. FIELDING: The machinery is provided largely in the act itself. If anything more is necessary, it would have to be covered by regulations.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Which clause covers the machinery?

Mr. FIELDING: Several clauses might be called the machinery of the act. What particular part does my hon. friend refer to?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with the stamp tax, I did not waste time going over the difficulties. I handed over the mass of rulings given in connection with the stamp tax. The whole thing is in an awful mess, and no attempt was made to solve the problem. The minister, however, had the help of the Bankers' Association in administering the act as regards stamps on cheques. Who is going to enforce this? Who, for example, is going to be charged with the duty of looking after it? Let us take the last clause (8):

> Save as aforesaid, a receipt liable to taxation under this section, shall not, except in criminal proceedings, be given in evidence, or be available for any purpose whatsoever, unless it be duly stamped in accordance with the law in force at the time when it was given.

How on earth can that be shown or proved? Is my hon. friend not going back to the old difficulty we had in the early days, in the fifties and sixties, when we had a law that said that a bill was no good unless it was stamped, and when a bill might be stamped just before it came into court?

Mr. FIELDING: Any court can enforce that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the court going to know about the matter?

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid, if there would have to be any prior knowledge in these matters, you would have to trust the department to exercise its authority in putting the matter before the court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How would the department know about it?

Mr. MARTELL: By the evidence brought before the court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Take the first two sections:

Section 14 of the said act as enacted by chapter 47 of the statutes of 1922 is amended by striking out paragraph (b) of subsection 4 and substituting the following:

"(b) a receipt or document in the nature of a receipt which is taxable under section 12 of this act.

(2) The following are inserted as subsections 5, 6, 7 and 8 of section 14 of the said act."

What is the effect of that?

Mr. FIELDING: Subsection (4) in the act reads:

The stamp duties imposed by this section shall not apply to the following cases:

Several are mentioned:

(b) A receipt or document in the nature of a receipt which is taxable under any other section of this act.

That is omitted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is any suggestion made at all by the minister as to how this section is going to be enforced?

The following are inserted as subsections 5, 6, 7 and 8 of section 14 of the said act:

"(5) A receipt given without being stamped may be stamped within one month after it has been given, upon the terms following, that is to say."

How is the department going to be seized of the knowledge of receipts that are not stamped? What is the machinery?

Mr. FIELDING: If there is not ample machinery in the act, the minister will have to do this by regulations. I have no doubt this act will call for a vigorous administration, and that the Minister of Customs will see that the machinery is provided.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not provided in the legislation.

Mr. FIELDING: If you impose penalties in the act, you can rely on the department to enforce them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know when this bill was distributed, but I have not had an opportunity of reading it carefully. It may provide for penalties; it may provide for imprisonment. I am asking how it is going to be enforced, and the minister cannot tell me anything about it.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member might ask how any part of our law can be enforced. He might ask how the customs law is enforced. It is going to be enforced by the vigilance of the customs officials.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The customs officials have their duties laid down. Is a whole host of new officials going to be appointed who will have the special duty of inspecting receipts, or are the people to make returns of their receipts to the department?

Mr. FIELDING: So far as I know, there is no intention of appointing an army of officials. As to the balance of the question, we shall have to leave the matter to the administration of the minister and his officials.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it to be the law that if a man puts a stamp on a receipt after the receipt has been signed, and not at the time it was signed, he must pay $10?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not wish to give any legal interpretation of the law. On most of these things the law is plain. If there is a doubt in the matter, I am going to leave the minister to interpret it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister desire the committee to pass a provision that if a man does not put a stamp on a receipt at the time it is signed, he must pay $10? The bill has not been long distributed, and the sections have not been read. Surely we have a right to know what we are supposed to be passing.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend will find in all these things that the law is plain and distinct and can be read intelligently. If there is a debatable matter, I certainly will not want to be led into giving a definition of it at this hour. I would leave the matter to be interpreted by the proper officials of the Customs department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister does not know what the law is going to be. I am going to read it:

5. A receipt given without being stamped may be stamped within one month after it has been given, upon the terms following that is to say:

(i) The stamp shall be affixed to the receipt in the presence of any collector of customs and excise by the person who gave the receipt, and shall be cancelled in the same manner as provided by subsection 2 of this section.

(ii) Before such person may affix the stamp he shall pay to the said collector of customs a penalty of $10 for the public uses of Canada.

Where does the principle of the $10 fine come from? Does it come from England or is it fixed by the minister? What is the idea?

Mr. FIELDING: The penalty is $50, but the man may avoid it by paying $10 in the way described.

Mr. JACOBS: Subsection 6 provides with reference to the penalty of $20 that payment may be made "to the judge, arbitrator, referee or trustee". I think it would improve the subsection to amend it so as to read:

—and the receipt may, on payment of a penalty of $20 for the public uses of Canada, be received in evidence, etc.

Judges do not usually receive these penalties.

Mr. FIELDING: The amendment suggested by my hon. friend seems reasonable, but I should not like to accept it without first consulting the Department of Justice.

Mr. JACOBS: Judges as a rule never receive such sums of money; the clerk or some other authorized person receives it on behalf of the treasury of the Dominion. It is most unusual to provide that the penalty shall be paid to a judge.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is new.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend wants to press the amendment I shall delay the third reading of the bill in order to consult the Department of Justice. The amendment seems reasonable, but I hate to disturb a clause of this kind without consulting those who have drafted it.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Definition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the proposed change in "19AA"?

Mr. FIELDING: It is to determine the question of "duty paid value." It differs slightly from the old clause but the purpose is the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any change in substance, or is it merely a question of form?

Mr. FIELDING: The words are nearly the same as in the old section. There is a slight departure, but the substance is the same.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Excise tax on wines.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the effect in this is to do what was mentioned in the budget resolutions?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It goes a little further, I think. It makes an exception of sparkling wines, "containing not more than 40 per cent of proof spirit."

Mr. FIELDING: There is no change in that respect.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take the minister's word at once, but my recollection was that it was 26 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that 26 per cent is used in the French treaty somewhere, but there is no change here from the resolutions.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Tax on sales.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 6 is amended, as will be found in the order paper of to-day, as follows:

That in section six of said bill, the third paragraph of subsection one of section nineteen BBB be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"Provided that the consumption or sales tax specified in this section shall not be payable on goods exported; or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale and which are articles subject to the consumption or sales tax, or on goods imported by a licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale and which are articles subject to the consumption or sales tax; or on goods imported by a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for under the provisions of subsection (7); or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for under the provisions of subsection seven of this section."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been following the resolutions as brought down on May 11, and I assumed that the bill would be in keeping with them. Suppose a spinning manufacturer buys needles from another manufacturer for the purposes of turning out knitted goods, is any sales tax payable on the needles? As I read this, no tax is to be levied, but I have seen some discussion which rather indicates that if a licensed manufacturer buys from another licensed manufacturer goods which are not classed as materials, the tax must be paid.

Mr. FIELDING: You would have to pay the tax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then my hon. friend is not doing what he said would be done in this resolution of the 11th May. I thought the bill would stick to the resolution, except where directly changed by an amendment. The resolution reads:

On sales by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufacturer or producer of goods To be used in the production of articles for sale.

Now, if one manufacturer sells thread to another, that thread is no more used than is the machine. It is another instance of where the department may apparently say that one thing is to be taxed and another is not. Surely my hon. friend's adviser is wrong there, or else we are using language in these resolutions, not to express our thoughts but to conceal them.

Mr. FIELDING: The bill, as is usual, is a little more full than the resolutions. I think my hon. friend will find that the bill deals with the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What section?

Mr. FIELDING: I think the amendment under consideration covers the point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I think we are there dealing with the question of exports and imports. Here is something that is really of importance, and surely parliament knows what it is doing.

Mr. FIELDING: Sometimes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely we are supposed to know, or is the minister serious in proposing that we put through legislation that neither we nor he know anything about? If I am right in assuming that we are dealing intelligently with these matters, we ought to know what we are doing. I point out to my hon. friend that here what is sold by one licensed manufacturer to another licensed manufacturer for the purpose of manufacturing should pay no tax.

Mr. FIELDING: What is my hon. friend quoting from?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: From the resolutions.

Mr. FIELDING: The resolutions are not before the House; the bill is. If my hon. friend will quote from the bill he will be making a better choice.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have only read the marginal notes of the bill. I thought my hon. friend would know what his bill is intended to provide for.

Mr. FIELDING: I refer my hon. friend to the beginning of the proviso at page 5.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That, as I understand it, has only to do with imported articles.

Mr. FIELDING: The amendment? Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If there is any dispute about it, let us get it settled. I am not speaking of imported articles at all. We will take the bill. I put the same question to my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING: Read the proviso.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Reading):

> Provided that the consumption or sales tax specified in this section shall not be payable on goods exported; or on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufacturer or producer if the goods are to be used in, wrought into, or attached to articles to be manufactured or produced for sale.

My question is perfectly plain. Does that exempt, for example, needles which are bought for the purpose of manufacturing?

Mr. FIELDING: I will have to answer my hon. friend that I am so advised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That the sales tax would have to be paid?

Mr. FIELDING: In that case, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought the principle here was that no sales tax whatever was to be paid by the manufacturer except the 6 per cent on the goods he sold.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that is correct, the answer given by my hon. friend two minutes ago is absolutely incorrect. If the manufacturer has to pay a tax on the stuff he is using for the purpose of manufacturing, he is paying more than 6 per cent on his manufactured article, he is paying 6 per cent on a whole lot of his raw material.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not quite grasp my hon, friend's contention. A needle is a part of the machinery, it is not one of the articles to be wrought or made into the finished article. My offhand opinion is that it would have to pay duty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is all very well to say it is a machine, but it is something which wears out.

An hon. MEMBER: All machinery wears out.

Mr. FIELDING: It is not going to be wrought into anything else.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This section before did not use the words "wrought into" at all. It covered merely "sales by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufactured or producer of goods to be used in the production of articles for sale." It is absolutely clear that what I pointed out to

my hon. friend was right in the first instance. I had an idea that the act was following the resolution. It does not follow the resolution, it contains the words "wrought into."

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the minister's intention is to tax Canadian manufacturers 6 per cent on everything they buy for use in the production of their goods, that is, on the actual raw materials that go into the finished article; am I right?

Mr. BUREAU: Used in the goods, not in the production—"are to be used in, wrought into or attached to articles to be manufactured."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let me put my question to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau). Is it the intention that the sales tax, instead of being confined merely to the finished article, is to be paid on everything except the raw materials that actually go into the goods to be manufactured?

Mr. BUREAU: As against what,—the machinery?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, moving parts and everything else.

Mr. BUREAU: Machinery ought to pay a duty. It is not wrought into the goods, it is used to manufacture them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It has not been so considered. Those who have gone into business have done so on the faith of the resolution, and I have told them myself in reply to objections taken to the sales tax, that it was quite clear that the principle was just what the minister said himself originally, that the only tax, as against the manufacturer, should be on his finished product, and that needles and the like used—just following the words of the resolution—would be exempt. However, now we get the fact.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6 as amended carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is subsection 1 of section 6.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, pages 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are all interlocked with section 6. The whole section is under debate because one relates to the other. I am not declaring the section carried, so it is debatable.

Mr. MacLAREN: On page 7 between lines 25 and 30 the date is given which is to apply to those who have considerable stocks on hand. I understand that there is no sales tax on stocks if they are held up to the 31st March, 1924. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FIELDING: I direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the words "not accounted for before the 31st day of March." The holders of these stocks must account for them so that it may be a matter of record. They are not obliged to dispose of them before that date.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am told that if the period could be extended to three months it would go a long way toward meeting the conditions affecting those who hold heavy stocks bought under the old provisions of the sales tax.

Mr. FIELDING: They may sell the stocks at any time after that date, provided they have rendered an account of them.

Mr. MacLAREN: My point is that until they have disposed of stock which they bought under the old provisions of the sales tax they will suffer some hardship if the collection of the 6 per cent at the source is now enforced. If the period be extended to three months, they will by that time have disposed of a sufficient amount of the stock bought under the old conditions to relieve them of a certain amount of disability.

Mr. FIELDING: If the requirement were that the stock should be disposed of before that date, my hon. friend's criticism would be well founded, but all that is required is that they shall be accounted for; they can be sold later.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is not a question of selling them. They will not have used up, during that period, the stock bought under the former conditions.

Mr. GERMAN: I wish to call the minister's attention to a telegram I have received regarding subsection 8 of section 6. It is from the Rogers Manufacturing Company, and it says:

> Subsection 8 of the proposed sales tax bill 230 of June twentieth regard proposed charging manufacturers sales tax on imported materials and refunding same when such materials are finally manufactured and sold seems impossible of administration because of manufacturing of large importations of raw metals into many thousands of individual items sold in thousands of lots throughout country which would require millions of refund claims. This particular change from the Finance Minister's proposal May twelfth would require manufacturers to carry investment of 6 per cent on cost—

Well, that is provided for, but this question arises: These people are manufacturers of flat

ware,—knives, forks and spoons—which are made out of raw material that is imported. These are sent all over the country in small lots. Would it be possible to keep an account in order to get a refund of the amount of the sales tax paid?

Mr. FIELDING: I think the amendment to which I have already directed my hon. friend's attention is such that sales tax will not be paid on the raw material used in the manufacture; it will be paid on the finished article.

Mr. GERMAN: That is what I thought, but I wanted to have the point made clear.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the subsection carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is subsection 1?

The CHAIRMAN: We are on the whole of section 6.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought we would get along better if we dealt with the subsections separately. However, let me call attention to subsection (3) of 19BBB. It reads:

> If the minister determines that any manufacturer or producer, who does not manufacture or produce goods to the value of ten thousand dollars a year, uses a substantial portion of goods which are exempt from the tax in the manufacture of goods which are liable to the tax, as to which the minister's finding shall be conclusive, such manufacturer or producer shall take out a license as required by subsection six of this section.

Does the government desire absolutely a blank cheque here, or is it the intention to put some reasonable restriction upon the exercise of ministerial fancy?

Mr. BUREAU: Do not call it "fancy"; that is hardly right. Make it "discretion."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I think "fancy" is a pretty good word to use. They are leaving it wide open to the minister to say that certain people in this country shall be taxed or shall not be taxed simply because the minister for some reason thinks they ought to be or ought not.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know any system of taxation you can carry on without leaving a large measure of discretion to the officers in charge. If they abuse their privileges or exercise them in any oppressive way, the only remedy is discussion in this parliament. I could not offer any system of taxation to which my hon. friend's criticism might not apply.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can my hon. friend mention any system of taxation from which he got that provision? I think it is one of Mr. Tinling's ideas. Is that taken from any act anywhere? Is there any precedent for it? If so, I have not been fortunate enough to run across it.

Mr. FIELDING: I am told it is designed to meet the case of the smaller confectioners who ordinarily will not take out a license but will use considerable amounts of material. There are cases of the kind which in the experience of the Customs department render this clause desirable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then this is entirely new? There is no precedent for it?

Mr. FIELDING: Well, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is right, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: I think so, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are not following the precedent of other acts or anything else?

Mr. FIELDING: Oh yes, we had a precedent from England a moment ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, if there is any doubt about it, let us get it right. A moment ago the minister said there had to be wide discretion in the collection of these taxes. I asked if there was any precedent for this very extraordinary exercise of that quality of discretion—because it goes to the root of this question of taxation. Now my hon. friend tells me there is no precedent for it at all.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no need of any.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A moment ago we had it that there was no precedent; that it was something new. If I am wrong in that, I should be glad if the minister would tell me. That being so, this being something new, I am going to ask my friend what percentage is meant by the use of the words "a substantial portion of goods." What percentage will my hon. friend be content with? There should be some amendment there to make this something like a law, and not something which is going to allow this minister to do something this day and somebody else the next. There is no definition here whatever as to what will be regarded as a "substantial" portion, and the section itself says, that it shall be left absolutely to the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: Why not?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, generally parliament has been thought to be the proper

source of taxation and not a minister. What parliament here is asked to do is to say that the minister can impose special taxes on special people as he chooses to designate.

Mr. JACOBS: That is already in the law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What law?

Mr. JACOBS: That the minister's finding shall be conclusive. It is left to the minister's discretion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not the point at all. What you have in the law there are matters in connection with quantum and the like, rulings on statutes. This is not a question of ruling on a statute. It is a question of the minister making his own law and saying that Jones shall pay and Smith shall not pay. He can do just as he likes.

Mr. BUREAU: If I read the section correctly what my hon. friend objects to are the words "a substantial portion of goods." The clause reads:

If the minister determines that any manufacturer or producer, who does not manufacture or produce goods to the value of ten thousand dollars a year, uses a substantial portion of goods which are exempt from the tax—

Now what would my hon. friend call a substantial portion?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I am asking. I want to know what the government proposes to do.

Mr. BUREAU: It is left to the minister's discretion. My hon. friend is proceeding on the assumption that the minister will determine that a substantial portion in one case is five per cent, in another case fifteen per cent, in another case twenty per cent, and so on. Otherwise his argument could not stand. The only objection he could take to this clause is that it leaves discretion to the minister as to what shall constitute a substantial portion of the goods. Well, he must give credit to any minister that is at the head of the Customs department not to play with that discretion and determine on five per cent in one case and eighty per cent in another. We have officers in the department, and recommendations can be made to the Governor in Council. I for one do not propose to have two rulings on two different measures. If fifty or sixty or seventy-five per cent is determined to be a substantial portion it will be the same for every one. My hon. friend's argument that we can play with this power is based on the assumption that the man who is going to be at the head of the Customs department is either a fool or a knave.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are a hundred and one different businesses that will be subjected to this, and a hundred and one different ways in which it could be worked.

Mr. JACOBS: To whom would the hon. gentleman give discretion if not to the minister?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should have it fixed in the House whether a man is taxable or whether he is not. I do not think the parliament has the right to delegate its authority to tax, that is all.

Mr. BUREAU: Parliament does not delegate any authority at all. It simply gives power to interperet the words.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not desirous of delaying the committee. I understand we are on subclause 3 of 19BBB.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on section 6 generally.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to what perhaps has been overlooked. I do not think there is any objection to this. The suggestion I have to make would properly come on page 5 after the section referring to "sale price" defined. It has reference to concerns which manufacture and retail direct to the people, perhaps dealing more particularly with confectionery, cakes and such like. That is, cases where a bona fide retailer is also a manufacturer. It is claimed by these people that at present the officials of the department presided over by the hon. Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue determine arbitrarily and without statutory power that the valuation for taxation shall be sixty per cent of the retail price. No objection is taken to that, but it is not provided for in the statute, and the suggestion is made that provision should be made in the statute for the minister to make regulations in that regard. I have to suggest to the minister an amendment to come in after the word "thereto" in line 8 on page 5 of the bill following the clause that reads:

For the purpose of calculating the amount of the consumption or sales tax, "sale price" shall mean the price before any amount payable in respect of the consumption or sales tax is added thereto.

I propose an amendment to add after the word "thereto" the following:

Provided, however, that the minister may in the case of goods manufactured for sale to the consumer by a person carrying on business exclusively by retail determine by regulation upon what portion of the actual sale price the tax shall be calculated.

In other words, that in the case of businesses where a retail manufacturer sells direct to the consumer the minister by regulation shall have the power to fix the price upon which the sales tax shall be applied. If it is provided for already in the bill I would be very glad to have it pointed out, but it is pointed out by those more directly interested that the bill does not provide for it at the present time. I know very well that it certainly intended to cover it but I do not think it is covered in the bill. If this amendment is acceptable I would offer it to the minister.

12 m.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will turn to section 13 on page 8 he will find that that is covered. Section 13 reads:

Whenever goods are manufactured or produced in Canada under such circumstances or conditions as render it difficult to determine the value thereof—

That would be the goods described by my hon. friend.

—the minister may determine the value of the tax under this act.

I think that covers the point raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: I may say, so that the minister may understand the spirit in which I bring this forward, that I am quite prepared to accept his assurance that it covers the case if he will so assert, but the information I have is that it does not. At present in the case of a prosecution, for instance, while the interpretation given by many of the officials is that sixty per cent of the retail sale price is the amount upon which the tax should be levied, there is nothing in the act which authorizes the officials to make that price, and what I am after is that the act shall make it perfectly clear that the officials shall have the authority to fix such a price.

Mr. FIELDING: Under this clause I think they would have the power to fix the price, but not necessarily sixty per cent. I think my hon. friend ought to be willing to leave it to the judgment of the Minister of Customs. I think the words are broad enough, and unless it be found by experience that it does not interpret fairly I do not think the change my hon. friend asks is necessary. I have enough faith in Ministers of Customs, no matter to what government or party they belong, to believe that they are endeavouring to administer the customs and the sales tax laws in a spirit of fairness to all concerned. I hope my hon. friend will not press his amendment, I think he will find the point is covered.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: I might say, so that the minister will correctly interpret my remarks, that I am quite willing to accept his interpretation. That would be the purport of my amendment. If the minister is satisfied that under this clause any regulation made by him or his officials—that would be the Minister of Customs and Excise I understand —fixing the value at forty, sixty, seventy or any other percentage is legal, that is what I want to get at. If the minister is satisfied of that my amendment is unnecessary.

Mr. FIELDING: I think if the Minister of Customs made a regulation along these lines it would be absolutely certain that he could do so. As to whether it would be wise for him to do so, I would rather leave to his judgment than tie his hands.

Mr. STEVENS: In view of that I am quite willing to accept the minister's interpretation of the act in that regard.

Mr. FIELDING: Thank you.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had some discussion in connection with the question of 50 per cent. I did not get any answer to my question. Perhaps it is foolish to expect any answer in connection with this bill at all from anybody; but I did ask as to how subsection 7 was going to be worked out; how it was going to be ascertained as to the 50 per cent of the total sales so that this special privilege could be availed of; for how long that 50 per cent would have to continue; and what would happen when the 50 per cent was not maintained.

Mr. FIELDING: That I think you will have to leave to the minister.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am asking, though, a little information from the minister who is here. I suppose the government have some idea of what they are doing by this bill, but I am beginning to think they have not.

Mr. FIELDING: There were cases in the existing law when it was administered by my hon. friend where the Minister of Customs received large power, and my hon. friend did not see any danger in it at all. The Minister of Customs had power to define this, that and the other thing. My hon. friend did not then imagine any difficulty. I do not see why he should imagine difficulties now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is something very different. This bill goes further than any act we ever had.

Mr. FIELDING: We had this before.

This may seem at first sight a somewhat small thing; but if you take an area like Aylmer, Ontario, or the Okanagan valley, or many other sections where thousands of acres belonging to hundreds of individuals are devoted to the growing of tomatoes, this is an important matter. I would ask the Minister of Customs if it would be possible to do one of two things, either to interpret the act as it at present stands to include tomato plants, or to make the necessary amendment to include tomato plants in the exemptions.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the Minister of Customs was dealing with that. I can quite understand, upon all these questions, there may be possibly different rulings by the customs authorities. I really do not know what more the hon. member can do than to leave the matter to the judgment of the minister, and I hope he will give attention to what the hon. member has said. This does not require a change in the bill. If the ruling is wrong, I suppose he will make a ruling to correct it, but I presume he will not admit that it is wrong.

Mr. STEVENS: If the very genial and efficient Minister of Customs would intimate that such a ruling would be given, that would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BUREAU: A ruling was made by the Commissioner of Customs, and the question was discussed to-day again. My hon. friend says that tomatoes come in free. Supposing apples come in free, would that necessarily make the tree free?

Mr. STEVENS: The act makes the tree free and also the fruit of the tree.

Mr. BUREAU: One might go further. If milk came in free would you allow the cow in free?

Mr. STEVENS: The cow being a milk factory, I do not think the case is a parallel one.

Mr. BUREAU: The matter is under consideration, under an appeal from the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie).

Mr. STEVENS: Can the minister give some assurance?

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot give an assurance.

Mr. FIELDING: Hope, not assurance.

Mr. STEVENS: This "hope" business is rather discouraging at times. I see in the countenance of the Minister of Customs, some ray of, might I say, new hope reflected.

Mr. JACOBS: That means nothing. I have had experience.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was unable to get any information as to the clause relating to jobbers. If I cannot get any information from the ministers, I want to give them a little information which, I think, can fairly be considered in connection with this matter. I point out that a distinction is made between classes of jobbers, and that it is unfair to make a distinction between classes. I point out that business of the same character should be dealt with on a similar basis. I point out that the licensed jobber will be relieved of any burden as to refunds and such troubles and that he does not have to finance the tax on his purchases. The unlicensed jobber has to finance his tax, and in order to sell to the licensed manufacturer he must be in a position to know from whom he purchased the goods shipped; and he must keep his stocks separate. This is a very difficult matter in connection with bulk goods. The unlicensed jobber must also know when the goods were purchased and the prices paid. The government will have to keep a check on all this if we are to have anything like equitable treatment between the two classes. I have been met by the government with the statement that they cannot give any information, but I hope they will endeavour to inform themselves on the subject before they attempt to enforce this measure. I trust that something will be done to preserve a semblance of fairness in the matter. Is it possible to make these refunds? The minister cannot tell me anything about his machinery, but perhaps when we come to some of the other sections he may be able to ascertain from his deputy how the department will arrive at the amount of refunds that have to be made between now and the first of the year.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that there are not likely to be any refunds in the way my hon. friend describes, but there will be deductions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The matter can only be adjusted by means of stocktaking. Who is to take the stock?

Mr. FIELDING: The man owning the goods will have to be prepared to show a stock record. All these things are matters to be determined by conference between the parties concerned and the department, and I do not anticipate the difficulty which my hon. friend seems to apprehend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is only one way of checking up these deductions or refunds, whatever you choose to call them.

Any business man will tell my hon. friend that the only way of keeping a check on the matter is to take stock of the goods.

Mr. FIELDING: In a hundred cases the departments have to check up statements, and I presume the same thing will be done in this case. The officials of the department will have to check up the statements of the party wherever necessary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In other words, the man takes stock and the department checks his statement.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister any idea as to what that will cost?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is quite right that these deductions should be made in respect of unmanufactured goods, but why should not similar deductions be made in the case of manufactured goods unsold?

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the same rule will apply in that case; there is no difference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The section is exceedingly long and I do not see how anybody can read it in one breath and get the sense of it. If the minister says that it covers the completed article I am satisfied; but so far as I can see, it refers only to articles that must be further manufactured. If I am wrong the minister will correct me.

Mr. GERMAN: If the importer does not pay any duty where does the refund come in? How can there be a refund if no duty has been paid?

Mr. FIELDING: If a duty has been paid the manufacturer is clearly entitled to a refund, but obviously there would be no deduction if no duty had been paid.

Mr. GERMAN: This therefore would apply to goods already imported. It could not apply to goods to be imported in the future.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should be glad if the minister would clear up the point I have already raised. Does this refund apply to the finished article which is still on hand?

Mr. FIELDING: If the manufacturer has paid the tax he is entitled to the refund.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then we have it definite; the refund or deduction or repayment will apply to the finished article just as much as to the raw material.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. FIELDING: If they have paid the 6 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes; but everything now has to pay the 6 per cent.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Failure or refusal to keep books.

Mr. JACOBS: There is an anomaly in this section. Subsection 19E reads:

19E. If a manufacturer or producer fails or refuses to keep adequate books or accounts, in English or French, for the purposes of this act, the minister may, by notice in writing, require the manufacturer or producer to keep such records and accounts as the minister may prescribe.

I would suggest that we strike out the words, "in English or French" because otherwise it would mean that a manufacturer or producer might keep books in any other language—Choctaw or Iroquois, for instance—and could not be proceeded against.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think my hon. friend is correctly reading the section. It means that the use of the Choctaw language would be an offence.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not strike it out altogether?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then Choctaw would be good. My hon. friend does not understand Choctaw.

Mr. JACOBS: Nor do I understand this section very clearly. If a man does not know either English or French, and keeps his accounts in Spanish or Italian, it ought to be a very simple matter for the department to find out whether his books are properly kept or not. He ought not to be penalized if he cannot keep his books in English or French.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is another argument.

Mr. FIELDING: If you are going to make an active requirement that the accounts should be kept, I think it is right to specify English or French. I do not agree with my hon. friend that Choctaw could be used.

Mr. BAXTER: I think some consideration should be given to the suggestion of my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). Our English and French ancestors acquired this country by achieving mastery over the people for whom my hon. friend pleads. The minister might perhaps consent to an amendment to permit the use of English, French or Choctaw—and then my hon. friend's objection would be met.

Mr. JACOBS: As my hon. friend has helped me out of the hole, I would suggest that he include Micmac, which I understand is current in New Brunswick.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 8, subsection 19G—Refund on goods sold to province if province exempt from tax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why should this refund be made? I always understood my hon. friend required the money.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of this, I am advised, is that a local government, for example, could import an article free of duty, but in the case of a manufacturer or producer producing the same article he would be subject to tax. In that case when he sells to the local government he could get a refund so he would be put on even terms with the importer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This shows the infinity of trouble my hon. friend is making for himself. I thought it was bad enough when we had a lot of refunds at the commencement, but now apparently claims can be put in anywhere.

Mr. FIELDING: They are all there for a good purpose.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not see why the principle that underlies the exemption of provincial governments should not be extended to municipal governments as well or else be denied to all.

Mr. FIELDING: Under the British North America Act I am afraid we cannot tax the Crown, that is, a provincial government, but we can tax a municipality. That is the ground of the difference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think in cases under the Income Tax Act as to questions of priorities and the like we had the general right of taxing fairly well settled. As to the liquor case in British Columbia my recollection is that the Privy Council decided that we had the right.

Mr. FIELDING: For resale.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We put it on resale in that case. Does my hon. friend suggest that the provinces have not to pay customs tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: That is one of the interesting constitutional questions that arise in Canada. We are advised that in all probability we have not the right to impose the tax on provincial governments unless they have the goods for resale.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think to-day we are taxing for customs.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a nice legal question to put it mildly and I do not think we ought to put a tax on the provinces which would involve us in difficulties.

Subsection agreed to.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Government or provincial sales; use of postage stamps.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does that refer to?

Mr. FIELDING: Subsection 3 of section 19 is the clause which permits the use of postage stamps, which after a given date are no longer to be used.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—Schedule 1 amended.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the effect of that?

Mr. FIELDING: The passages struck out relate to confectionery and beverages, which were the subject of discussion before.

Section agreed to.

On the title.

Mr. MORIN: Before you report the bill, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct your attention to a defect in the French translation of the bill. In the English version, in the 25th line of subsection 8 of section 6, the words appear, "no deduction to be allowed in respect of such goods not accounted for prior to the thirty-first day of March, 1924." These words are translated as follows: "aucune remise ne devant être accordée concernant des marchandises possédées." The word "possédées" means on hand; it should be replaced by the proper French translation of the English words, "not accounted for."

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend having called attention to the defect in the translation, I have no doubt that it will be remedied.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Wednesday).

Wednesday, June 27, 1923

The House met at eleven o'clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata.) presented the fourth report of the Joint Committee on Printing.

INDUSTRIAL GROUP OF GREAT BRITAIN

GREETINGS BY WIRELESS TO PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have just received the following cablegram:

Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux,
Speaker, House of Commons,
Canada.

The members of the Industrial Group of the House of Commons visiting the Marconi Company's wireless telegraph stations send from Radio House, London, greetings to the members of the Canadian Parliament. They recall with pride the fact that the first long-distance wireless telegraph service in the world was established by Senatore Marconi between Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada.

Secretary, Industrial Group,
House of Commons,
Radio House,
London.

To this cablegram I have despatched the following reply:

Secretary,
Industrial Group,
London, England.

In the name of Canadian House of Commons I wish to reciprocate your greetings and to thank you for your thoughtful reference to Canadian pioneering experience in wireless which, if possible, links the Dominion more closely to Motherland.

Rodolphe Lemieux,
Speaker, House of Commons.

FUEL SUPPLY

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond) presented the third and final report of the Select Committee on Mines and Minerals, and moved:

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the third and final report of the Select Standing Committee on Mines and Minerals the minutes of proceedings and evidence with reference to the possibility of an independent fuel supply for Canada be printed in blue book form and as an appendix to the Journals of the House, and also that rule 74 be suspended in connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 246, to amend the Post Office Act.

He said: By an amendment to the Post Office Act in 1920 a new schedule of postal rates was applied to newspapers and periodicals. At that time the rate was one-quarter

[Mr. Murphy.]

of a cent per pound. The new schedule raised the rate on an ascending scale until it reached the maximum of 1½ cents per pound, which went into effect January 1, 1922. Strong objection was made to this maximum rate, particularly on the part of publishers of small town dailies and of weekly newspapers circulating in the rural districts, and it was alleged that the increase represented an added expense of at least five hundred per cent to this class of publishers. They asked that the maximum rate be reduced to three-quarters of a cent per pound, or that in any event it be made not more than one cent a pound instead of the 1½ cents established by the amendment of 1920. This request has been repeated at frequent intervals during the past year and a half both by individual representatives of these publishers and by delegations and correspondents, and after observing the operation of the act the Government is of opinion that the maximum postal rate on these publications might fairly be reduced to 1½ cents a pound. It is to give effect to this decision that the present amendment is introduced.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the minister not add to his explanation a statement of how the present rate compares with the actual cost of carriage of these publications to the country?

Mr. MURPHY: I would be pleased to do so if I had a statement of that kind prepared. The proposal, of course, will represent a decrease in the receipts, but this decrease will be made up by increased business from other branches of the department. I will try to get information for my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that the charge now fails to bring in anything like the cost to the country of the carriage of these publications?

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend is correct. Of course, the disparity was all the greater two years ago when the rate was only a quarter of a cent a pound, and it was still greater prior to that time when newspapers used to be carried free.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN NATONAL RALWAYS—BRANCH LINES

*Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. Is it proposed to recommence construction on the Hanna to Warden and Loverna (Saskatchewan) to Warden lines, in Alberta?

2. If so, what are the proposed routes?
3. Where is it proposed to locate divisional points?
4. Will Big Balley and Hanna continue to be divisional points?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I can give no further information in answer to this question than has been given already in the discussion on the Branch Lines Construction Bill.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This question was placed on the order paper before the discussion the minister refers to took place. I am quite content to let the question drop.

Question dropped.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—COAL

*Mr. SHAW:

1. What persons, firms and corporations in the province of Alberta supply coal to the Canadian National Railways?
2. What price is paid per ton?
3. Are the contracts for such coal awarded by tender?
4. For what period have such contracts, if any, been awarded?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I think on reflection my hon. friend will agree with me that it would not be in the interests of the Canadian National Railway Company to make this information public. The purchasing of this coal is not an easy matter for the buying department of the railway company, and to make public to every coal dealer what business we are doing with the other coal companies would probably tend to a combine on their part which might very materially increase the cost of coal to the railway company.

HALIBUT FISHERY TREATY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The second resolution on the order paper I notice is worded, "In Committee of the Whole". I think this is a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is an error.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) has a resolution on the order paper relating to legislation arising out of the treaty, and I think it would be well to hold this resolution over until after the other resolution has been advanced a stage so that the treaty and the legislation pertaining thereto may be considered at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

DR. F. G. BANTING

EXPRESSION OF THE NATION'S GRATITUDE TO THE DISCOVERER OF INSULIN

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

That whereas the recent discovery of the insulin treatment for diabetes, by Dr. F. G. Banting of Toronto, as the result of devoted application and research, and the discoverer's disinterested and generous action in placing it at the disposal of the public, have conferred inestimable benefit, not only on the Canadian people but on sufferers in all parts of the world, it is expedient that Parliament should give some expression of the nation's gratitude to one who has rendered such distinguished service to science and humanity, and that such recognition should take the form of a vote of an annuity sufficient to permit Dr. Banting to devote his life to medical research.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to supplement the words of the resolution by any comment; they speak for themselves. Moreover, the great service which Dr. Banting has rendered to science and to humanity is now known throughout the world. The government has felt that some formal expression by the parliament of Canada of the services of this distinguished Canadian would be fitting at this time and in giving it the form suggested by the resolution we believe we are interpreting the wishes of all Canadians. It is perhaps appropriate that I should recall that during the war Dr. Banting also rendered valuable services as a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and was wounded in action. We feel that in Dr. Banting, who was born in Canada and is a graduate of one of our own universities, Canada has a citizen of whom all who belong to the British Empire are justly proud. He has brought added fame to our country and in return, as the representatives of the Canadian people in parliament, we desire to express our country's appreciation of the great work that he has performed for science and humanity. We hope that by the provision which the resolution suggests Dr. Banting may be enabled to devote his life to medical research in a manner which will add to the benefits his discoveries in the field of medicine have already brought to his fellow men.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the resolution, I think, constitutes a beginning, so far as public policy is concerned in this country, of recognition in any substantial way of scientific and humanitarian achievement. Dr. Banting being a Canadian and having achieved his fame and his contribution to scientific advancement in this country, it is appropriate that we as a nation should be the first to act in recognition of his services. I do not think, although not pretending to any particular scientific attainment, there can any longer be a doubt as to the supreme value of Dr. Banting's discovery and the beneficial, indeed the curative, pro-

perties which it possesses. Ample demonstration that this is the case has been made by those whose judgment may be taken as final not only in our own country but at various points in the United States and as well in other lands. What it means in the way of alleviation of suffering, in the way of contribution not only to the length but to the happiness of human life, it is impossible to estimate and quite impossible to exaggerate. That Dr. Banting should be especially rewarded and that at the same time the reward should take such form as would be to him an encouragement to pursue his scientific activities, seems to me axiomatic. I am personally aware—by those words I mean on the information of friends of his who undoubtedly know—that what this scientific man endured in the way of privation, in the way of personal sacrifice, in order that over a course of long years of experiment he might bring to fruition the objects he had in mind, is as yet, and probably always will be, unknown to the public at large. I can vouch for it that he made everything bend,—when I say everything I mean much that meant suffering to himself—he made all things subordinate to the attainment of his great goal; indeed, in doing so he only repeated what all men have had to do from the beginning of time to achieve any such wonderful result as he in this instance has brought about. Consequently it is only just to the people of our country, only just to the good name of Canada that this parliament should in a fitting way recognize what he has done for the nation and for the world. It is best from the standpoint of interest that we do it; for it will enable Dr. Banting from now on to pursue investigations along similar and other lines, from which investigations there is at least reasonable hope that results will ensue of great benefit to the human race. Therefore, as one who feels that the country should act in honour to its citizens; as one who feels as well that the greatest benefits to the world in the future are to come from scientific research and scientific achievement, I have real pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I feel very happy to have the privilege of being associated with the resolution now before the House. Dr. Banting's name is now known all over the world, and it is peculiarly gratifying to the Canadian people that a discovery so important and of such great benefit to humanity should have been made by a Canadian. I feel sure that money will have no peculiar attraction for Dr. Banting; that his great ambition is to achieve something for the benefit and the service of humanity. However, I am very glad that we are making some contribution which will in effect be opening the door of opportunity to him so that he can more consistently devote his time to the great work he has undertaken, a work which is a blessing to humanity and the results accruing from which bring honour to himself as well as to his country. I repeat that I am pleased to be associated with hon. members of the House in paying this tribute to Dr. Banting,—a man whom the people delight to honour.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister in charge of the Department of Health): Mr. Speaker, I desire to add just a few words in support of the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and to unite with him, the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke), in paying tribute to the eminent physician who has achieved so much in the path of science, and particularly of medicine, in Canada. This move of the House of Commons will redound not only to its own credit, but, I submit, to the credit of Canada as a whole. It is a sincere though feeble endeavour to recognize the services of one who through many long days and nights has devoted his efforts unremittingly to forwarding the cause of science, and who has, as it were, drawn aside the curtain which hides from the human eye some of the numberless mysteries of science. The exact nature of Dr. Banting's discovery is still obscure to the layman. In a word, it consists in reducing or controlling pathological activities which are normal in the human body if not carried to exaggeration. Sugar is an element of nutrition, important—indeed, essential—to the life of man but if it is produced in exaggerated quantities the result is disaster to the human body. The discovery of Dr. Banting tends to check this exaggerated fabrication of sugar in the system, and it is hoped that the use of insulin will not only temporarily reduce that pathological activity but do away with it entirely. Canada is still a young nation. It has however in the spheres of industry, agriculture and commerce accomplished enormous results. Unlike the European countries its steps have been somewhat slow in the field of science, literature and the fine arts. Only a few months ago it was my inestimable privilege to preside at the opening of an exhibition of paintings in our Museum. Those paintings were exclusively the work of Canadians, and I cannot say how much impressed I was by the excellence of the exhibits. Time will come, and only time can

accomplish that, when Canada will take her place among the older European nations in the field of fine arts, sculpture, music and painting. Dr. Banting's discovery does not rank as an achievement in the fine arts. It is a good deal more than that and will bring its own special advantages to humanity at large. And so I say it is the duty of the Parliament of Canada to take whatever steps are calculated to encourage men to devote their time with enthusiasm to scientific research, especially when the results of that work are to help humanity and relieve its sufferings.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House will accept the resolution unanimously, and as the minister presiding over the Department of Health I wish to say in the name of Canada that we extend our hearty congratulations and encouragement to this young physician, who has become illustrious not only in this country but in the world at large.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): When this question was before the House on the 27th of February last the minister took the position that he could not do anything for Dr. Banting. I notice that the resolution does not include the name of Mr. C. H. Best, Dr. Banting's co-worker and associate. I think the country will approve the action of this Government in granting this annuity to Dr. Banting. It is a step in the right direction to recognize these men who are Canadians and Britishers for contributing something towards the advancement of medical science. It is well they should receive some recognition before they have died or left the country. I should like to find out from the minister if the name of Mr. Best is going to be included, and if any recognition is to be given to Dr. Macallum, who has made important discoveries in helium, and to other Canadian scientists. The Government of the Province of Ontario has appropriated $10,000 per year to establish a chair in the University of Toronto for continuing Dr. Banting's work. I think something might be done as well for Mr. Best, Dr. Banting's associate and co-worker.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I should just like to point out one fact in connection with this grant by the parliament of Canada to Dr. Banting which has not been mentioned, and that is the fact as I am informed on very good authority, that Dr. Banting could have exploited this discovery and was offered an almost fabulous sum for the purpose of exploiting the remedy which he has discovered. If you look down through the history of medicine you will find, with one exception I think, that every discovery that has been made by a medical man in an effort to cure disease has been given freely to the world. Take antisepsis, which was discovered by Lord Lister, anaesthesia by Simpson and Morton, vaccination by Jenner, three of the most outstanding discoveries in scientific medicine in the history of the world and without which much of the health of to-day would be impossible. All these discoveries were given to the world freely. It might be of interest to the House, and I do not wish to utter any word of ill-feeling against anyone in this connection, to know that the one exception that occurs to my mind where a medical discovery was exploited was the preparation 606 which was discovered by Erlich, of Berlin, Germany. I personally am particularly glad, as I am sure is every medical man in the House, to see Canada taking this attitude towards the discoverer of a health-giving remedy, for unfortunately in the history of medicine and surgery too seldom has recognition been given. There is one country in the world, however, which has on many occasions honoured its scientific men more perhaps than any other country, and that is the Republic of France. As you walk around the streets of Paris you will frequently come upon a street named after some distinguished scientist, the Avenue Pasteur, for instance, and you will find many statues and monuments commemorating the men who have shown great learning in scientific work. I wish as a medical man, like the Minister of Health himself, to congratulate the government and parliament upon having decided to do this worthy thing.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): As we in this corner of the House have so frequently criticised public expenditure it is a great pleasure to be able to recognize the justice of the principles underlying this grant. I am not quite sure that it is setting a very good precedent for parliament to make grants in special cases, since I presume this body is hardly in a position to decide exactly who most merits recognition of this character, but until we have some other body constituted for the purpose I am very glad to see that we are recognizing an achievement of this character. I take it from the remarks which have been made in this House and throughout the country generally that there has been a real contribution in this case and that we are proceeding along right lines when we recognize advances that are made in the scientific world. This action appeals, too, because in this particular case the achievement is one that is made

in the interests of the saving of life, whereas very often we have honoured as our greatest heroes those who have made their achievements not in the saving but in the destruction of life. It is a decided advance when we begin to understand that the saving of life is infinitely greater than the destruction of life for any purpose whatever.

There is another point to which I would call attention, and that is that we are getting away from the idea that men will accomplish great things simply to attain monetary success and only under the spur of competition. These motives have been held before us as the only ones which control men's activities at the present time, and I am glad to think that we recognize that men can work and work hard for other than financial advantage.

I like the way in which the motion is expressed, that this grant is made not only as a material recognition of past work but in order that this scientist may be able to continue to carry on his work. We have had the statement put forth very frequently that unless men were driven by the necessity of achieving some financial success they would not do any work. I believe that idea is absolutely wrong. If they are at all assured that they will have a competency, the truest men will go forward to accomplish even greater results. This recognition is probably an act of justice in one case; but we must look forward to planning that a great many of the more obscure workers in the fields of industrial and scientific research, as well as in many other departments of our life to-day, shall be given the same opportunity which has been accorded to this one scientific student—that is the opportunity of carrying forward their work and of performing something worth while in the service of humanity.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): On behalf of the University of Toronto, and the other universities of Canada, I desire to thank parliament for this recognition of the discovery made by a worthy son of a Canadian college, Dr. Banting. Undoubtedly this action by parliament will have a beneficial influence within the University of Toronto, and the other universities of the country, and encourage their graduates, professors and students in the service of humanity and progress.

Motion agreed to.

HALIBUT FISHERY

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee this day to consider a certain resolution respecting the Northern Pacific halibut fishery.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS PROFITS WAR TAX ACT, 1916 AMENDMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee this day to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend subsection three of section 13 of *The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916*, and to remove the restriction of the said subsection by which the liability to pay the tax imposed continues for the period of only three years and by which the Minister is permitted at any time within three years only to assess such person for the tax, and to provide that the Act shall be construed as if the said restriction had never been contained therein.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Sir Henry Drayton: I assume that what is being done here is a rather circuitous method of extending the operation of the business profits tax until the collections are all made. The act was a temporary measure, and I assume that the legislation will be extended so that all collections can be made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may point out to my hon. friend that this is merely a motion to have the resolution considered later. The point to which he refers can be explained when the resolution itself is being considered.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That will be quite satisfactory, but my object in bringing forward the point now was that we might have some real, definite information on it when the resolution was under consideration. We had difficulty yesterday in learning anything.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee this day to consider a certain proposed resolution for amendment of the Income War Tax Act, 1917.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PROCEDURE—TORONTO VIADUCT.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): When the House adjourned last night it was agreed that the representatives of Toronto should be allowed an opportunity this morning on the orders of the day, or on a motion to go into committee of supply, of discussing the question of the Toronto viaduct. At the request of the mayor and council of the city of Toronto—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman not to make any extended remarks or argument on the present occasion. Ample opportunity will be afforded when the motion is made for the House to go into committee of supply in a few minutes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was agreed last night that an opportunity would be given my hon. friend to take up this subject to-day. Perhaps he might move the adjournment of the House, or we can move to go into supply.

Mr. CHURCH: At the request of many Toronto organizations—

Mr. SPEAKER: I should call attention to the fact that it is against the rules, unless on a matter of urgent public importance, that an hon. member should move the adjournment of the House. All those motions for adjournment have been done away with in the rules and proceedings of the House. Let us live up to the rules. This question can be brought up when motion for supply is made to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House will surely be going into supply pretty soon, and the hon. member will then have an opportunity to bring the matter up.

Mr. BUREAU: It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is desirable that this matter should be discussed, and the Government is quite agreeable that it should be brought up. We will proceed with supply when the orders of the day have been called, and the hon. member can then bring up the question.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister to order No. 45, standing in my name, which reads:

Resuming the Debate on the Motion of Mr. Neill for the Second Reading of Bill No. 6, An Act respecting Immigration.

I introduced this matter very early in the session and the second reading was adjourned from time to time at the request of the right hon. Prime Minister, who stated his conviction that the object desired to be attained could be better attained by means of negotiations with the nations concerned. We are now near the close of the second session of this parliament, and the province of British Columbia will be asking, with ever-increasing emphasis, what she is to expect in the way of relief on this subject. Is the Prime Minister in a position now to make any statement relating to the progress of the negotiation? Further, if the Prime Minister finds during the recess that these negotiations fail, will he consider the adoption on behalf of the government of this bill in question, which has proved very successful in New Zealand?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As I mentioned to the House on an earlier occasion, the government received from the government of Japan representations to the effect that the Japanese government were prepared further to restrict the immigration of their labourers from Japan. It was pointed out in their communication to our government that any legislation on this subject by the Canadian government might be misunderstood in Japan, particularly if it appeared to be of the nature of exclusion; the Japanese government, it was stated, were anxious, on the one hand, to avoid any unrest in their own country, and, on the other to further the wishes of the Canadian parliament in a friendly way. We were asked if we would allow the Japanese government to show, as a result of its own action, what it might be in a position to do or was willing to do in this regard. Conferences have taken place between the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) and the representative of the Japanese government in Ottawa, as a result of which I think there is every reason to believe that a very substantial reduction in the number of immigrants coming from Japan to Canada will be made in the course of the ensuing months. If by any chance the facts should show that this endeavour on the part of the Japanese government to restrict its own people in the matter of immigration to Canada is not sufficient to achieve the object which we have in view of limiting the number of orientals coming into Canada, then, at a subsequent session of parliament, the matter may again be considered.

HOPPE AND ISENBERG LEASES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SHAW: Can the Prime Minister tell me if the fiat issued in connection with the Hoppe lease has yet been cancelled by the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It has been cancelled, yes.

SUPPLY—TORONTO VIADUCT

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): At the request of many Toronto organizations, including the mayor and the corporation of the city, I desire to bring before the House this morning and discuss for about ten minutes the case of the city of Toronto and its agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway and its successors and assigns, now the government of Canada, and the Canadian Pacific Railway for the erection of a viaduct across the waterfront in Toronto. The lower end of the city of Toronto on Front street, between Yonge and York, resembles a city or town in Flanders or France, destroyed in the late war by the German government. The city of Toronto placed a contract with the railways before the Railway Commission, and after ten years of effort before that body, the other day a meeting was held at the City Hall in Toronto, at which meeting the Railway Board washed its hands of the whole agreement, and the matter is now in the hands of the government to decide. The statement of the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners delivered at the City Hall, Toronto, on Thursday the 7th June last, was as follows:

> This board has nothing to say as to whether the viaduct scheme will go through or not. It is out of our hands. We went so far as to say in Ottawa in 1921 that we would not interfere. It is now a matter for those concerned to raise the money.

The government is a party to the contract. The parties to the contract were the corporation of the city of Toronto, the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada;—it is now the Grand Trunk Railway and their successors and assigns, who are now the government. The city of Toronto has been treated in a most unjust and unfair way, not only by the present government, but by the preceding governments, in failing to carry out this agreement. The disgraceful conditions in Toronto have made that city waterfront a by-word for more than twenty years. Behind the presidents of the railways, whose policy has been a compound of evasion and procrastination, is the Railway Commission, the members of which washed their hands of the case, after loudly declaring that final jurisdiction rested with them. The Railway Commission is supposed to enforce the agreement between the municipalities and the railways and they have washed their hands of the affair. A large revenue has been contributed by the city towards the National Railways. The only forum we can go to and ask for the enforcement of this agreement is the parliament of Canada. An agreement is an agreement in law, even if it is made by a municipal corporation and the Grand Trunk. The government can be brought into the Exchequer Court and adjudicated in that way. Matters have been allowed to drift along till the present time. We have a station there which the Grand Trunk built some ten years ago, and it is now ready to be opened. But that station is an eyesore to everybody coming into the city. It is an up-to-date station, made to fit in with the elevated tracks which were proposed to be constructed. When this agreement was entered into the Harbour Commissioners did not look upon it as "a scrap of paper," but considered it a binding agreement between the railways and the city. They laid their plans before the government for the rebuilding of the harbour at Toronto at a cost of $26,000,000. Now, $20,000,000 of that money have been expended to-day to provide a right of way for this viaduct, and to provide new piers and breakwaters, for the carrying out of the agreement. Why is this document treated as a scrap of paper? Can the railways of this country ride rough-shod over municipalities of Canada in this way, and treat a solemn agreement as a scrap of paper? An agreement is an agreement no matter by whom it is made; and we say that Canada is a party to it, because under the description in the agreement the party of the second part is the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada hereinafter called the railway company and their successors and assigns. They are bound by that agreement. The Grand Trunk is not bankrupt. The sum of $73,000,000 was voted by this government the other night for railways and $26,000,000 in addition was for the purpose of extensions and branch lines. Many of these lines, of course, are not revenue producing, but for many years the branch lines have been producing a revenue. The Grand Trunk made most of its money in Ontario, and if the Grand Trunk had not been made a link in the Canadian National Railways they would have made money. According to the Acworth Report

on Railways of 1917 there was taken out of the old Grand Trunk in Ontario $22,000,000 cash and $122,000,000 credit for the Grand Trunk Pacific, with the result that the Grand Trunk became bankrupt and was not able to carry out its solemn agreement with the Harbour Commission. Now the party of the first part, the city of Toronto, has fulfilled its contract with the government;—and in making these comments this morning I want to have it understood that I am not criticising the present government, because I say that all governments since 1913 have treated this agreement as a mere scrap of paper.

Another contract was entered into with the city in connection with the sale of the lot on which the new union station stands. The Grand Trunk purchased a lot in 1905 and agreed to build an up-to-date station, and subsequently became a party to the erection of a viaduct on the waterfront so that the trains might be brought in that way and the city get the benefit of a proper terminal. The viaduct agreement has not been carried out either; like the rest, it has been treated as so much waste paper. It is signed by the four parties to the contract and it provides a penalty of $100 a day during the time of the failure of any of the parties to implement it. That penalty, accumulating from 1913, has now run into hundreds of thousands of dollars which the city could collect if it wanted to take steps in the matter. The city has no desire to institute legal proceedings, but the people of Toronto are absolutely tired of the way this whole question has been ignored. After ten years of waiting they are now impatient, and they are clamouring for proper treatment. When passengers arrive at the station they are treated like a lot of cattle. There are sixteen tracks across the waterfront at Cherry street, and almost as many at York and Bay streets. The level crossings are an eyesore to the city, and after the expenditure of such a large sum as $20,000,000 to prepare the right-of-way for the railway, it is not to be wondered at if the residents of the city of Toronto are now exasperated. Some of the tenants along the waterfront have been simply driven into liquidation through the failure of the parties to this agreement to observe their part of the undertaking. The railways cannot handle the business on these tracks, either in respect of passenger traffic or in the matter of freight. During the Exhibition 165 trains were assembled at the union station in the rush period, and this will given hon. members some idea of the state of congestion there at the present time.

I would point out to the government that after all it is only a short-sighted policy on the part of the National Railways to delay the execution of this contract, for if a proper terminal were provided for the people it would increase the receipts from freight and passenger traffic. The agreement it is estimated will call for an expenditure of $32,000,00, to which the city of Toronto is liable to contribute one-third. That $32,000,000 is made up in the following way: The new station, including land, represents an expenditure of $9,500,000. That sum has already been spent. For land damages, the sum of $7,500,000 was to be provided; and the amount to be spent on the viaduct construction was fixed at $16,000,000. As I say, the first item of $9,000,000 odd has been spent so that there is only approximately $22,000,000 remaining to be expended, of which the city of Toronto is to provide one-third. And the city is ready and willing to-morrow to put up its share if the Railway Board will proceed with their part of the contract. Now there is no use in the government going around a circle in this matter. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) made some reference the other day to Sir Henry Thornton in connection with this question. Well, I do not think that there is any room for argument, nor has either the Railway Board or Sir Henry Thornton, any option, so far as this contract is concerned. Here is a specific agreement to which we have the seal of the company; and neither Sir Henry Thornton nor the Railway Board can set it aside. A contract is a contract, and all that is required in this case is that parliament shall provide the money which is called for. The representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Harbour Commission, the city of Toronto, and the Grand Trunk have held between twenty and thirty meetings in an endeavour to adjust the dispute. We inquired of the directors of the Grand Trunk what their stand in the matter was, and they informed us that they could do nothing. They said: "You have your contract; get the government to carry it out". Let me inform the House that we will carry out our part of the contract if parliament will provide the money to enable the railways to do their share. There is absolutely no use in vacillating on this question until Sir Henry Thornton comes back. Sir Henry Thornton, in the first place, is not a cure-all for the transportation ills of this country; and in any event the contract should be carried out. Why should the government have to wait for Sir Henry Thornton?

As I have stated before, there is only one course open to the government, and that is to include in the estimates a sum sufficient to begin the operations necessary under the National Railways' part of the contract. The Canadian Pacific Railway declared the other day that they were ready to carry out their bargain, and the Mayor of the city expressed the same preparedness. We are simply waiting upon the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we have been waiting thus ever since 1913. The citizens of Toronto are absolutely disgusted at the way this contract has been ignored, and visitors to the city are impressed in any but a favourable way. Besides this, there is considerable damage being caused the business interests of the city through the failure of the government to observe its agreement. Lands on which we could get factories established are lying idle simply because the Grand Trunk will not make a move in this matter. Surely the Harbour Commission and those persons who are interested must have some recourse against the government for the damages they have sustained. They have been out their rentals from this $20,000,000 worth of revenue producing property. They have not been able to get any revenue from it, and are now drawing on capital with the result that deficits are being piled up. The people of Toronto are sustaining damages and cannot get the use of their own property. In England, in Australia and in the United States the railway legislation provides a summary remedy for situations similar to this; any municipality can enforce a contract with the railway corporation in the event of failure on the part of the latter to carry out its terms. But to-day in Canada the railways are altogether supreme. They can go into a municipality, enter into a contract and then ignore it, interfere with trade and commerce, occasion damage and ruin to business, drive people into liquidation, and apparently be immune from the consequences of their actions. That is the condition of affairs as we have it in Toronto at the present time.

In 1913, an act was passed, as Chapter 26, 1 and 2 of George V to consolidate the acts relating to the harbour of Toronto. By this act the docks were to be moved into the bay and new bulkheads and pierheads were to be built. The Minister of Public Works of that day, the Hon. Mr. Rogers, stated that the Harbour Commission would have to start building their works before the government would undertake any expenditures. The Harbour Commission then spent $20,000,000 The government, I may say, has not done so badly so far as harbour improvement is concerned. But certainly in regard to its contract in connection with the union station it has failed miserably. An order in council was also passed by the government in 1913, providing for the carrying out of these works in the harbour, and that order in council shows that the work was to be completed in the year 1916. It was provided in the main agreement between the railways and the city that the work should begin within one month from the signing of the agreement. Up to date not a spadeful of earth has been turned towards carying out this agreement. The work was to have been finished in 1916, when we were to have a new union station with elevated tracks across the waterfront. Seven years have elapsed and nothing has been done. It is not a question of law. The agreement has been validated by legislation, and althrough the railway companies appealed the judgment of the Railway Commission, the Privy Council declared it to be binding on all parties.

I regret that at this late stage of the session I have not an opportunity of laying all the facts before hon. members, because this is the only body that can give the people of Toronto the relief which the viaduct agreement provides for. The Grand Trunk Railway Company is a party to the agreement, and in the opinion of eminent counsel who have been consulted, the government of Canada are the successors and assigns of the company. It is no use now to refer us to Sir Henry Thornton and the directors of the Canadian National Railways. We were referred to the Grand Trunk Railway Company by Sir Robert Borden when he was Prime Minister, but repeated interviews with the Grand Trunk directorate and officials extending over a period of ten years did not bring us the slightest satisfaction. The city of Toronto has been treated very unfairly in this matter. Instead of building sundry branch lines for the Canadian National Railways that will not be revenue-producing for some years to come at least, I think the government would have been better advised to carry out this viaduct agreement, for the works covered by it would more than pay fixed charges.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I shall support the statements of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) very briefly by informing the House of some particulars regarding this proposed work. For thirty years the city of Toronto endeavoured to protect its citizens crossing the waterfront, and when we reached 1913 interest in the question was revived and it was pressed upon

the railway companies very strongly. The city submitted a plan for the elimination of the waterfront level crossings at a cost of about half that involved in the present plan. But the latter plan was the work of the engineers of the railway companies. They said to the city council: "Your plan is not complete. Here is a larger and better and more comprehensive plan." Some of us thought at the time that the railway companies were hopeful that the increased cost involved by the adoption of this plan would frighten the city council and prompt its rejection. I was a member of the council that year and I recall the circumstances very clearly. When the engineers of the railway companies submitted a plan which straightened out the line from the station to Cherry street at double the cost they said: "Any other plan is insufficient and we will accept nothing but the plan which we are now submitting to you."

Mr. GRAHAM: From the station east to Cherry street?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, a matter of a couple of miles. The straightening of that line involves the removal of millions of dollars' worth of buildings. But the city council said: "Yes, we will accept your plan and fit it into our harbour plan. It will increase the cost of our harbour, but it is a good plan and we want to make a complete job of the whole thing." I want to impress upon the House, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Toronto has acted as fairly, as generously and as honourably as any municipality could act.

The city has been forced to agitate for this viaduct in order to save the lives of its citizens. The crossings on the esplanade are really death traps, lives have been lost there on occasions, and it is a wonder to me that more fatal accidents have not occurred. We have opposite, across the bay, a beautiful park of 1,500 acres. On holidays as many as 100,000 of our citizens cross at Bay street, and they have to pass over ten railway tracks with cars shunting up and down all the time. This crossing is right at the throat of the coach yard of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and every Canadian Pacific train running out of Toronto comes over that crossing to the yard and back again to the station. Consequently there is more traffic at Bay street than at any other two crossings in the whole city. All through the summer tens of thousands of people use the Bay street crossing, and the only protection afforded them is by means of gates.

I should like the House to consider the urgent necessity for this work. One of the leading papers of the Dominion, the Toronto Globe, has during the past few months been constantly bringing this subject before its readers. I suppose we have perhaps one of the finest railway stations in the whole Dominion, but it stands there like a monument, with not a track near it, and with no preparations being made for running trains into it. Only the office portion of the building is being used. In the meantime over half a million people, possessing a beautiful modern station, are compelled to use perhaps the most inefficient railway structure to be found on the whole North American continent.

Mr. MACLAREN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GRAHAM: Not as bad as St. John.

Mr. MACLAREN: There is one exception—the minister has mentioned it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I foresaw it.

Mr. HOCKEN: I rather take issue with my hon. friend there, because although a very small and inadequate station may be bad enough in a city of the size of St. John, in a city of half a million it is a good deal worse. Everyone who goes out of the union station must cross from two to five tracks, according to the track where his train is standing. This is bad enough for Toronto people who know the dangers to be guarded against, but for strangers it is a much more serious matter.

Mr. VIEN: You are always sober in Toronto.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, if only drunken men were killed on these crossings we would have fewer casualties. But any person is liable to meet with an accident at the old station. We are forced to use it by reason of the refusal of the railway companies to carry out their agreement. Now, that agreement was not forced upon them, it was the outcome of their own proposition. I am not going to curse the former government, because this happened in the middle of 1913, and during the war we could hardly expect the necessary expenditure to be made. But I think the time is come when something should be done, when at least a start should be made in carrying this work to completion. It is going to take several years to construct, and during this time we will have to suffer more or less inconvenience, but we shall be willing to put up with this in the sure and certain hope of ultimately having relief. We have spent $20,000,000, and I presume before we are through we will spend another $10,000,000, on our harbour, and we hope that from the construction of that harbour our water borne traffic will largely increase. But every ton of freight that comes in by water now has to

cross these eight or ten or twelve tracks at Yonge street, Church street, Bay street or some other street. That is a serious handicap against the development of water borne traffic that ought to be removed; there ought to be free access for the freight traffic as well as for the passenger traffic to the pier heads in our city. During the summer months the volume of passenger traffic out of Toronto to the St. Lawrence, to the Niagara, to Hamilton to Port Dalhousie and Grimsby is enormous, to say nothing of that which goes to the Island every day. A number of people approximating 25 per cent of the whole population of the city crosses these tracks every day. It is a condition that I do not think exists anywhere else on the North American continent, and it is one which the government really ought to take some steps to alleviate. I know the Minister of Railways is familiar with the situation there, and I do hope he will persuade his colleagues to put an appropriation in the estimates this session. It is not too late yet; we can bring down another list of supplementary estimates. That would give my hon friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) a chance, because I am told there is nothing for his department in the present estimates.

Mr. MURPHY: We are practising economy.

Mr. HOCKEN: Why not bring down, as my hon. friend from North Toronto suggests, an appropriation of two or three millions to get the thing started to get the surveys made and be ready to go on next year? It is a work that ought to be carried out and, the Lord knows, the city of Toronto has been a patient though helpless sufferer during all these years.

Mr. HENRI E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of hon. members on this subject, especially those of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), who has given the House some details of a certain agreement entered into between the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the city of Toronto, and later, I believe, the Canadian Northern Railway Company. It would seem that it was a habit of the late government to ignore or disregard contracts which had previously been entered into by the federal government with municipalities or cities throughout the Dominion. I have much sympathy for the situation in which Toronto, the capital city of Ontario, finds itself so far as railway facilities are concerned, but if I may be permitted I would like to draw the attention of the House to the position in which the city of Quebec was placed by the late government in the same connection. In 1910 the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, through the Transcontinental Railway Commission, of which Hon. S. N. Parent was chairman, entered into a contract with the city of Quebec for certain works and improvements which were to be carried out there. After the change of government in 1911, however, all the plans that had been agreed upon by the commission, representing the government, and the city of Quebec, were set aside. A written contract had been signed before notary Edmond Taschereau, of Quebec, for the erection of a union station on the Champlain market site in Quebec. The tenders had been called for and a contract had been entered into with Mrs. Gosselin, of the city of Levis, for the construction of a station building valued at $2,000,000. Moreover, by this contract the government undertook to spend not less than $2,000,000 for the approaches and other facilities connected with the union station. To that end they purchased three miles of frontage on the St. Lawrence river at Quebec city. Subsequently the government asked the city of Quebec to abandon the Champlain market property, which was valued at not less than $5,000,000, in order that it might be used for the purposes that I have described. The city consented to hand this valuable property over to the government at the nominal price of $100,000, having in mind the construction of these facilities that were so greatly needed. The city were therefore obliged to purchase another market property and erect another market building, and also to provide docks for the convenience of the small market boats that come to Quebec. The city purchased a new market site at the fot of Crown street on the St. Charles river and spent a very large amount of money for the erection of a market there, having in view the taking of action by the government to go ahead with the St. Charles river improvements. A contract had also been entered into with the government for these works before 1911. The then Minister of Public Works, Hon. Frank Carvell, who answered some of my interpolations at that time on the subject, told the House that the late government had spent $1,750,000 on the St. Charles river works. These works, however, were abandoned on account of the war. Moreover the contractors for the St. Charles river work were indemnified for resigning their contract, and I believe it cost the government between

five and six hundred thousand dollars to take over the work. The government had spent on the St. Charles river work over $2,000,000, a very large part of which expenditure is now wasted by deterioration of the work through neglect. We repeatedly urged the late government to go ahead with these works which were abandoned for no reason whatever and to give the city of Quebec the railway facilities to which we are entitled. We were not asking any favour of the government, but simply for what was our due.

We asked the railway management to go ahead with the work under contract in Quebec and to go ahead with the St. Malo repair shops. These shops were erected in the city of Quebec at a cost of over $2,000,000 and we were promised that they would employ from three to four thousand men, but they were closed two years after they were erected. The result is that repairs of cars have now to be made at Moncton and Winnipeg when we had right in the city of Quebec shops that were perfectly equipped to do that repair work. Moreover, we were also promised that a main building would be erected in connection with these shops for the building of engines and passenger cars, but that main building has never been built. Sir Robert Borden when Prime Minister, and his colleagues the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister representing the district of Quebec, Hon. Mr. Pelletier, all acknowledged that Quebec was entitled to these facilities, that it was her due under the contract, and all of them expressed astonishment that the work was not being proceeded with, and they promised the citizens of Quebec, that justice would be done to our city which had made sacrifices in order to get what was due to her. Since I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House I have endeavoured on many occasions to see that justice be done to our city and to the district of Quebec, and over and over again we have been promised that justice would be done. We were in the same situation as the city of Toronto, about which my hon. friend has spoken this morning. The city of Quebec was neglected by the late government, just as it would appear that the interests of the city of Toronto have also been neglected.

I should like to refer for a moment to the declaration that was made by Sir Robert Borden on October 22, 1913, at the banquet tendered to him in the city of Quebec. I quoted this in a speech I made in the House of Commons on September 15, 1919, and it will be found on page 292 of volume 1 of Hansard of that year. At that banquet he promised on behalf of himself and his colleagues that the city of Quebec would obtain justice and that he would see to it that the government would carry out its obligations and the contract in regard to the city of Quebec. We all know that the city of Quebec was neglected by the late government, and we have repeatedly complained. I think our friends from Toronto who have spoken on behalf of that city to-day were not exactly in the same position that we of Quebec were in, because they were friends of the late government. But even they could not obtain what was due to their city, and so to-day they come before this House and ask for justice to the city of Toronto. I am quite sure that this government, which is animated by a good feeling towards every province of confederation and every city of this Dominion, will render justice to the city of Toronto, as I hope and indeed feel perfectly sure they will to the city of Quebec, whose interests were badly neglected by the late government. We had the honour and the pleasure of receiving lately in the city of Quebec the new president of the Canadian National Railways, Sir Henry Thornton, and he like all the officers of the government who have visited our city, admitted that the city of Quebec had been very badly neglected, and we have every confidence that Sir Henry Thornton will see that justice is done to our city.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): May I, on behalf of Toronto, express the sympathy of that city with the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Lavigueur) and the city of Quebec, of which he was at one time mayor, in having their grievances presented to this House. Toronto will help in any way it can to get justice done to Quebec. But the question really before the House and the one to which I must direct myself concerns the city of Toronto, and for just a few minutes I propose to deal with that—probably from my own point of view, but certainly from some knowledge of the situation.

Now what is the situation at Toronto? It is this: It is a city on the waterfront and every approach to it by means of rails except the old Great Western line—now Grand Trunk; Canadian National—is on the lake level. Every other railroad comes into Toronto on the high level of the plain immediately surrounding the city, and the elevation of all these roads before they enter Toronto is quite two or three hundred feet above the level of the lake. In the old days the Grand Trunk was only able to approach the city on the level, but was not in a position to bridge the rivers, and therefore it took the easier way of building on the lower level. Now, the problem is this: An agreement was made, and

the city of Toronto is calling for the carrying out of that agreement by the companies. In the meantime there is an immediate relief for the situation. In what does the relief consist? First of all, the use of the new union station immediately. To do that you must take all the through traffic, and especially that of freight, from the front of the city by the cross-town line that now exists on the upper level, and remove a part of the existing difficulty, and to try and reduce the obstructions and inconveniences as they now exist to the public. Now, by building a cut-off line of four miles on the right of way of the Canadian Pacific from Leaside—and the National Railways now own one-half of all that double track right of way—from North Toronto Station on to Leaside—and then directly east from Leaside to a junction with the Canadian National railway tracks in Scarboro and to a second junction with the Grand Trunk at Scarboro junction all that freight traffic can be taken off the Esplanade to the north, and the only cars left on the front will be the passenger trains and the local freight traffic that must be handled on the lake level. Those four miles of double track can be built immediately at an expenditure of not more than $500,000, including one temporary lumber viaduct across the Don in addition to the two now existing, the high level bridge on the west Don and the high level bridge on the east Don. All that work can be done in four months. When that is completed all the through traffic which now encumbers the front of Toronto will be taken off the esplanade and across the city to the north. In that way thousands and thousands of dollars in the consumption of coal alone by the railways can be saved. Because here is what takes place now. Every train coming into and going out of Toronto, with the exception of the Hamilton trains must be lifted up two to three hundred feet in order to get over the rise whether westerly to Guelph, the rise by the old Northern to the north, or the rise on the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific to the north east by way of Agincourt and Scarboro in the east. But between these two heavy grades which exist to-day to the north and east of Toronto, and which are totally unnecessary, the cut-off line to which I have referred, including a temporary viaduct over the Don, can be built at a cost of less than $500,000. There will be immediate relief given and the new union station can come into use within three months. That is the practical proposition I wish to outline. I am not abandoning in any way the claims of Toronto to the carrying out of the esplanade agreement but you get an entirely new view point of the situation if you carry out the improvements I have outlined and take away this traffic on the front to the north. The fact is that the grade out of Toronto by the old Grand Trunk at Scarboro is a one per cent grade; it is one of the worst grades in Canada. The Canadian Pacific Company grade to Wexford is another one of one per cent. But between the two lines there can be obtained, and has been surveyed, a grade of one-half of one per cent which was discovered some years ago. The improved line on that improved grade can be built and put into operation for less than half a million dollars and the new station can come into use immediately. Later a permanent viaduct may have to be built and other things done. When you come to deal with the esplanade there will be immense claims for damages. This matter has got to be settled and settled immediately. The government and the railways are parties to it and an immediate settlement must be brought about. In the meantime all the trains can come in and go out in accordance with the plan which I have indicated. Trains to the west will go out on the esplanade where the grades have been separated. The trains that have to go east will proceed by way of Parkdale and Davenport to North Toronto, which is the proper place for a great new station for the city.

Mr. CHURCH: What is to become of the harbour?

Mr. MACLEAN (York) The harbour will be improved by this scheme. There will be an open front and everybody will be able to get to it by overhead bridges. In the meantime the best route—the best route for handling passenger traffic; one that is convenient to the street car system and the radials, that shortens the distance in the mileage, and reduces the cost of operating the railways—is by way of north Toronto. The saving in mileage alone for passengers coming into Toronto from every quarter by making the station at North Toronto will be immense. Then there will be the saving to the railways by the avoidance of the grades to which I have referred, the worst grades in Canada. Those grades can be avoided by taking the traffic to the north. If the scheme I have outlined is carried out relief will be afforded to the city of Toronto almost immediately. The Minister of Railways knows about these facts, also the engineers of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railway. In a word what I suggest is this that the new station which is one of the finest in the country, be put into use immediately; that the trains going west go along the front where there is now a com-

plete suppression of grades, and that all east bound trains, go round by way of Parkdale and North Toronto, where there are no level crossings to be overcome.

Mr. CHURCH: That will mean scrapping the viaduct order.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No it will not. My proposition will improve the harbour by taking a great deal of traffic off the front. It will also improve property in that part of the city. But it gives a real service and real use to the new union station. It will afford a much better point of distribution for the passenger traffic, not only the people who live in Toronto, but those who come to that city, if they can enter the city from the north rather than the south. At North Toronto, Parkdale, or West Toronto Junction or Davenport, there could be a better distribution of the traffic immediately throughout the city than exists to-day, I say that the agreement must be carried out and the esplanade situation relieved. What I suggest should be done this summer and it could be done at an expenditure of less than half a million. It would furnish relief in the southern portion of the city and a better entrance to the city could be secured. All the traffic that now encumbers the waterfront can be taken away, the distance can be shortened and economies can be effected. Toronto would then have a new front. Toronto is no longer the city of the old days on the waterfront, but it is becoming a great and growing city to the north end and west, because one of its developments now is to the north. The development cannot be to the south. The harbour would be much improved, if the approach to it were improved by taking away all freight and passenger trains. I hope we will have a declaration from the minister, on behalf of the government, that not only are they prepared to carry out the agreement which the railways and people have made and to which the government is a party, but that they will undertake to afford immediate relief in the direction I mentioned, and if they do that they will have made a beginning in the settlement of the Toronto harbour problem. It will take years to build the viaduct, and it will involve millions of dollars in damages, how large the damage will be I do not know. I cannot say who will find the money. I make the prediction that the moment claims for damages come to be adjusted, the claims will run up into twenty, thirty or forty millions. Everybody is waiting for an opportunity to present a claim for damages, and they have a right to put them in. There is a real and immediate solution of the problem, without interfering in any way with the claims of the city for the carrying out of the agreement.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): I do not intend to delay the proceedings of the House because I realise that hon. members are anxious to get home. But this is an important subject and I want to impress upon the government the urgency of action, and the desirability of some statement on the part of the Minister of Railways in regard to the situation in Toronto. There has been a lot of talk in this matter, but no action. I do not think the solution proposed by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) will at all meet the requirements of the situation. I am fairly conversant with the condition of things in Toronto and I know that there is a great volume of business at the south end of the city that cannot be disregarded because there is a great traffic on the waterfront, the one working in conjunction with the other. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) have fairly submitted the matter to the House. They are both ex-mayors of the city of Toronto, and therefore know all about the agreement, and what they have stated is the absolute fact; the city of Toronto has not been given the treatment to which it is entitled. I was an ordinary member of the city council in 1913, when the agreement went through between the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the city of Toronto, and a solemn undertaking was given to build the viaduct. The government, I think, should carry out the contract of the Grand Trunk since it has taken over the line. I desire to quote briefly from the Toronto Board of Trade News of March, 1921, with reference to this agreement:

> The Harbour Commission upon the execution of the viaduct agreement of July 29, 1913, revised their waterfront development plans of 1912—

I think it is well that parliament should know all the facts in connection with this case. If it did I am inclined to think that justice would be done in this matter.

> —and immediately proceeded to prepare in detail plans for the development of the inner harbour waterfront between Cherry and Bathurst streets, a distance of approximately two miles. As a result of the viaduct agreement it was decided to extend the pierhead or harbour head line, a maximum of some 1,100 feet in the vicinity of York street, and to proceed immediately with the dock development between Cherry and Bathurst streets; also to reclaim

an additional 295 acres of property along the inner harbour waterfront, in addition to the reclamation of some one thousand acres of property known as the Eastern Harbour Terminals, which was prior to 1912 Ashbridge's Bay marsh.

It would not be easy to have access to that property if this railway were diverted to any other part of the city. The improvements were all brought about as a result of the proposed plans of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk and the Harbour Commission.

The commission have proceeded absolutely along these lines in accordance with their undertaking and they and the Dominion government have to date expended approximately $19,000,000 thereon, reclaiming in the inner harbour to date 60 acres of new land and constructed three miles of modern dockage, of which 27 acres of land is now under lease and option. In the eastern section 450 acres have been reclaimed and 4½ miles of dockage constructed and 250 acres are now under lease and option. New industrial plant and equipment in the newly developed sections have been erected by private capital to the amount of approximately $8,000,000.

We must have access to these properties.

The main entrance to the eastern harbour terminals is, as is well known, via Cherry street, at which point there are 16 tracks, on the level. The viaduct order provided for the elevation of these tracks, and it was with the expectation that this would be done that the harbour commission undertook the reclamation and improvement of the eastern harbour terminals. Our tenants are still confronted with the necessity of having to use this dangerous crossing and times without number are subjected to unreasonable delay by the blocking of the crossing by freight trains and switching movements. Furthermore, the district is subjected to an added premium as regards fire insurance on account of the Cherry street level crossing.

Of course, matters such as these are of no consequence to railway companies as they apparently are not interested in the development of the eastern or central harbour terminals, and, just so long as they can operate trains in and out of Toronto at grade, little consideration will be given to this matter. The inconvenience or delay caused citizens in general in the carrying out of their daily business pursuits is apparently of little consequence in so far as railway interests are concerned.

All of the above moneys have been expended by the harbour commission in perfectly good faith and the interest and sinking fund charges have to be paid thereon from the revenue derived as a result of the improvement, and, if these properties are to be subjected to temporary approaches plus the closing of one of the main arteries, viz., Bay street, then there will be ninety acres of property in the inner harbour waterfront, between Simcoe and Church streets, valued at over four million dollars, a large amount of which will remain idle for many years—Why? Because the railway companies refuse to carry out their portion of an agreement made between them, the city and harbour commission. The effect will be strangulation of inner harbour waterfront improvements.

The harbour commission and the city have repeatedly pressed for the commencement of the viaduct construction since 1913, mainly for the reason that the harbour commission were, as a result of the viaduct agreement, constructing and reclaiming property in the eastern harbour terminals and along the inner harbour waterfront; little consideration was given to these repeated requests for the reason that the railway companies were not suffering as a result of the delay.

Furthermore, as a condition of the agreement waterfront properties being improved were to be provided with proper access thereto, and I have no hesitancy in saying that the work would never have been proceeded with by the commissioners had it been anticipated for one moment that the agreement of 1913, solemnly executed by all parties, would not be carried to completion.

I need not read further. Hon. members will see that a solemn agreement was entered into between the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the city of Toronto. The city is prepared to carry out the agreement. In view of the long delay by the railway companies to do their part, I think the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) should tell members from Toronto what action he proposes to take.

Mr. CHURCH: Are you in favour of moving the viaduct up to Donlands?

Mr. SPENCE: I certainly am not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) shall have leave to withdraw his motion?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I was waiting in the hope that the government would say or do something in connection with the matter. Apparently there is nothing to be said, nothing to be done. I am not going to take up the time of hon. members further than is necessary to place this question fairly and squarely before the House and the country.

The genesis of this matter is to be found in the order of the Railway Board of December 30, 1908—fifteen years ago. In granting the order the then Chief Commissioner, Mr. Justice Mabee said:

I am free to confess that when I embarked upon this inquiry I thought the erection of bridges the proper solution of the problem, but the more it is thought out, keeping steadily in view the permanent welfare of a large and rapidly developing city, I am driven to the belief that if bridges are erected this year, ten years hence would see them all torn down.

The railways were not content with this order and appealed to the Privy Council, which decided in favour of the city in 1911. In the same year, on the 1st August, an order was made by the Railway Board providing for the commencement of the work within two years. Again the railways were not satisfied. Their apeal to the Privy Council, of course, was on questions of law; they now took an appeal to the Governor in Council

on the merits. When the appeal came on for hearing in 1913 the railways brought down a plan for a glorified viaduct, and the hearing was adjourned for the purpose of the city considering it. Subsequently the city accepted the railways' proposal and the appeal was not proceeded with.

As a result of the city's acceptance of the proposal, in the place of a viaduct costing $9,000,000, a viaduct, then estimated to cost almost double that sum, was to be erected. The agreement between the railway companies and the city embodying the railways' new proposal was submitted to the Railway Board and aproved under its order of July 31, 1913. One would have thought the matter had been absolutely settled;—settled in the first instance by the order of the board; settled in the next instance by the judgment of the Privy Council; settled in the third instance by the railways themselves when the newer and enlarged programme was agreed to by the city; settled finally by the Railway Board when it put its imprimatur upon the agreement on July 31, 1913. As I recollect, the work was to be commenced within two years. Then the war came on.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), the part of the work to be done in connection with the new and glorified structure proposed by the railways necessitated very large expenditures by the harbour commissioners of the city. On the faith and strength of that agreement the work has been done, and scores of millions of dollars have been spent.

Mr. VIEN: Is it finished?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why, it is not started.

Mr. VIEN: I am referring to the part of the work that was to be done by the harbour commissioners.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Every single bit of the work which is necessary for the building of the viaduct and which was to be done by the harbour commissioners has been completed, and we are out the interest on the capital expenditure all these years.

There is something further. As a result of this glorified programme we have had to do other work, part of which is governmental and part municipal. The government entered into an arrangement for the doing of their part of the work and a good deal of it has been constructed, such as the cribbing and the breakwaters, but it is not yet finished. I just want to point out, as showing how this matter has been neglected, that under the former administration we gave as much money as could be given for the purpose of getting this work done where it was most needed. The essential breakwaters were put up; the votes were $1,000,000 to $2,000,00 or $3,000,000 a year to that end. The work that was left to be done was largely the bridging of the approaches. That work has not been done, and the city has been trying in vain for the last two years to get these bridges built. I venture to say there is not a single public artificial highway anywhere else in Canada for which the government is responsible in connection with which the government has not constructed the necessary bridges. We have the artificial highway at the eastern gap, and on the other side there is a park largely used by the labouring people of Toronto, a park that was to have been connected up by this bridge over the artificial channel made by the government of Canada.

Not only is it a part of our common responsibility to do this work, but arrangements were made for it years ago; yet we can get nothing, not even a statement from the minister one way or the other. This is not merely a Toronto matter; it is not a municipal squabble. Even if it were, the fact that the municipality has spent millions based upon its faith in the honour of this country is surely sufficient. But it is much more than that; it is something that the whole hinterland of Ontario is interested in. Think of the spectacle we have to-day: a splendid station building that cannot be used; the placing of lives more or less in jeopardy every day through the use of a station that is obsolete. Why can the government not say something? What do they want us to do? Do they want us to understand that solid agreements mean nothing, amount to nothing? When is the agreement to be carried out so far as that bridge is concerned? Two bridges are called for, one over each of the artificial channels.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is the western channel finished?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Dredging is still going on there, but it is government work; the city part of it has been finished. So it is with the eastern channel—there is no difficulty about putting a bridge over the eastern channel to-day, but we can get nothing at all, one way or the other. Are we to understand that agreements mean nothing?—that unless some particular political influence is exercised no action is to be taken? I would have thought the matter was so clear that we would have without the slightest delay a statement from the government. Millions have been spent; nothing has been done. If we cannot get anything else, perhaps we could get a statement

as to how much longer the government thinks nothing should be done, no relief should be given.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to hear my hon. friend scold so; he is generally good-natured. If the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) during all the years that he was head of the Board of Railway Commissioners had waited on Sir Henry Drayton and talked it over with him, we might have made some progress, because subsequent to 1913, the year of which he speaks, he was either head of the railway board or Minister of Finance. But he does not seem to have waited on that gentleman at all when he had all the authority. I am surprised, to use his own language, that he did not say anything. How much longer did he want Toronto to wait?

Mr. SPENCE: It was war time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not after 1918.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend permit a question? How many millions did we spend in that time for the purpose of implementing that contract?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know how many millions the then government spent in implementing the contract. I do know that all the money that was spent was in the erection of a station and the post office in connection with it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, no.

Mr. GRAHAM: The station was erected, I believe, by the Toronto Terminals Company through the sale of bonds, the shareholders of that company being the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I am not going to reply to my hon. friend in kind, but I think it is fair to point out that his great anxiety about the completion of this viaduct, seems to have possessed him only since the latter part of 1921. Previous to that time he had the power as a member of the government to do all the things he is asking this government to do, or very many of them. He had the power as Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners to insist that the agreement made in 1913 should be carried out, but it was not carried out and has not been up to this day. I am just saying that by way of supplementing my further remarks.

The problem is a difficult one. My hon. friend found it so when he was Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, otherwise he would have had the viaduct completed ere this; and he found it so when he was Finance Minister. The agreement having been made in 1913, there was every reason in the world for not proceeding with the work up to 1918, but there was no reason why it should not have been proceeded with following the close of the war; the necessity then was just as great as it is to-day. I agree with everything that has been said as to the situation in Toronto, except that I think one point has been exaggerated by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), who said that all the passengers had to cross the tracks when they got on and off the trains at Toronto. Well, if they wish to walk upstairs they do not have to cross so many tracks. I know it is not so convenient, but there is a way to go upstairs and go out to the upper level to Front street. Of course I, like all the rest, insist on going out on the lower level because it is more convenient, hence I have to cross some tracks. But the situation is far from ideal and I agree with everything that has been said with regard to it. The situation in Toronto is just the same now as it has always been so far as the Grand Trunk Company is concerned. The Terminal Company consisted of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the contract was made with the two railways.

Mr. MURPHY: And the city of Toronto.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, and the city of Toronto. The contract was made in 1913 and my hon. friend has correctly given the history of it. But the government to-day, as the only shareholder of the Grand Trunk, stands in identically the same position as that in which the shareholders of the Grand Trunk stood when that agreement was made. I think my hon. friends would not urge that the government should proceed to take from the Toronto Terminal Company, the Canadian National Railway Board or the Canadian Pacific Railway management their authority to proceed with the construction of the viaduct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does not my hon. friend know that the whole reason for the delay was that the Grand Trunk could not finance their share?

Mr. GRAHAM: That was the excuse and possibly the reason.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does not my hon. friend know it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does not my hon. friend know this further that his own directors have said that it is entirely that question, entirely a question for the government to say whether they will finance it?

Mr. GRAHAM: In a measure my hon. friend may be correct. To come back to the question, my hon. friend's suggestion and that of the other hon. gentleman is that the government without the recommendation of the Canadian National Railway Board should proceed to put a vote in the estimates to complete this work whether the board want it or not. I say that whatever negotiations are carried on and whatever arrangements are come to should be arrived at as between the companies. Following that, it is true that if any work is to be done the parliament of Canada would have to pass a vote for the purpose, but for parliament to pass the vote before something was decided upon as between the city of Toronto and the companies, and I understand that negotiations are going on continually, would be the wrong way of going about it. But I do not want to continue the discussion. My hon. friend from South York has taken a different view. I do not know whether he wants to take the tracks up to the Donlands or not, but there is something in his view that the whole trackage should be removed from the waterfront and an entrance made farther north. It is said that in a multitude of counsel there is wisdom, but when the counsel is so conflicting I do not know that I can get much wisdom out of it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I want my hon. friend to understand that I did not for one moment abandon the rights of the city of Toronto to the construction of the viaduct.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure that my hon. friend if he adheres to the viaduct, could make out a good case for the removal of the tracks from the waterfront because that is the purpose of the viaduct. If the tracks were removed to the north the viaduct would not be required. This is a very large question and I agree absolutely that it does not alone interest the city of Toronto, it interests all the travelling public passing in and out of this great centre of the province of Ontario, which is the city of Toronto. The traffic originating in and around Toronto and in the province of Ontario is I presume the largest traffic of any province of the Dominion for the Canadian National Railways, and I am in hopes that before very long something will be arrived at of a definite nature between the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian National and the city of Toronto so that the situation may be alleviated. Generally speaking at the present moment the work would not be a productive expenditure, but the traffic is increasing so rapidly in that particular centre that there should be a method of handling that great traffic that would save annual expenditure, and in that way be productive, because the traffic particularly, is handled at risk of life and the expense of handling traffic must be greater than it would be in a well conducted terminal. We have a station there costing I think my hon. friend said $9,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The station was $4,000,000. The original viaduct was to be $9,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Up to the present time, I am told, the station has cost $6,000,000, and in addition to that the government contributed some $2,000,000 for a postal station.

Mr. CHURCH: May I ask a question? The position taken by the city is that they want the contract carried out. They want the viaduct, the whole viaduct and nothing but the viaduct and that they will not consent to the new station being opened until they get the viaduct. Could the minister tell the House whether his law officers advise that the government is a party to the contract as standing in the shoes of the Grand Trunk Railway the party of the second part in the contract?—and being such a party the contract can be enforced by specific performance and the government taken into the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is always a difficulty in suing a government. In the first place if we say that the government becomes a party to the contract in place of the Grand Trunk, suit could not be entered against the government except by consent, that is by fiat, and that sometimes is not so easy to get. The better way is to have this thing straightened out amicably if possible, rather than by reference to the Exchequer Court. My hon. friend has asked me a question. I say that the situation so far as responsibility is concerned is not changed one iota by the transfer of the Grand Trunk stock. The Grand Trunk as a corporation is part of the Canadian National Railways, and the Canadian National assumes the responsibility formerly assumed by the Grand Trunk. There is therefore no change in the relationship of the Grand Trunk although the government is the shareholder.

As my hon. friends can understand, it is difficult to give a definite statement. I hope that when the president of the Canadian National returns from the West and the president of the Canadian Pacific from across the sea they will get together with the city of Toronto at close range and discuss this matter with the hope of coming to some amicable arrangement by which the situation in Toronto can be relieved.

My hon. friend from Quebec county (Mr. Lavigueur) made an eloquent plea this morning for the city of Quebec. I do not wish to go into details, but to express the view that I have great sympathy with him when he said that the original plans for the terminals at the city of Quebec were far superior to the ones later adopted.

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester): The advocacy of the hon. members from Toronto in the interests of their city reminds me of a duty, that I should bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways the fact that on lesser scale but in serious measure we have a corresponding situation in the town of Truro, the chief town of the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I shall be thankful if I am not told to go to the Railway Board, and if I go to it I shall be thankful if I am not sent back to the Minister of Railways; and I am speaking partly from surmise and partly from experience. Tennyson in his "Vision of Sin" describes a voice that came from a clear sky and in very clear tones but in language that no man could understand, and I am a little afraid of that mystery when I press for the rights of the town of Truro corresponding with the rights for which the hon. members for Toronto are pressing. Some who love that town regard it as a miniature of Toronto, with streets and physical characteristics resembling Toronto's, with the instincts and temperament of its people resembling those of the people of Toronto, and that to some extent would constitute a compliment in the opinions of some hon. members. On the other hand, by pointing out the resemblance, I run the risk of keeping away from Truro some of my good friends elsewhere in this parliament. The town of Truro has a population of about eight thousand, and it has those deadly level crossings in a very important and central part of the town. One of the hon. members for Toronto put forth the fact that the holiday seekers in his city were compelled to cross the tracks there to get to a picnic resort, which I appreciate not as a luxury but as a necessity. But a still greater necessity obtains in my own town because hundreds of the homes are so situated that little children have to cross some half dozen pairs of rails to get to school, and during the hours of their absence you can well imagine that the hearts of their mothers are suffering very unfair and very real anxiety.

The traffic is such that a subway is very urgently needed. The freight shed, wisely or unwisely, was put upon the side of the rails whereby it is necessary to haul the freight over these tracks. In the winter-time the snow is often missing from the tracks, and besides the inhumanity to the horses engaged in hauling the freight there is considerable loss in time, worry, wear and tear connected with the hauling, to use language which is mild in the very extreme, and to say nothing of multiplied danger in this freight traffic. This matter has been agitated for some time. Now and then a life is snuffed out on these rails just as is the case in Toronto. I do not think there is any fear that a great catastrophe will happen in the sense of a number of lives being lost by any one happening. I think that happening is just about as remote in the modern town where I live as in the great city of Toronto, or vice versa; but, Mr. Speaker, there is that continual danger present to individuals, and there is the periodical loss of life, the importance of which of course we cannot exaggerate. At a country crossing, where a driver is passing with a team of horses or automobile, we can with some fairness say that it is up to him to exercise due vigilance and allow nothing to distract his attention with some possible reverence we may say that an accident would be the driver's fault. But the matter is entirely different in a city like Toronto, or even in a town like Truro. In the case of persons coming home hurriedly, chatting in groups or wearied with the exertions of the day, it may be found that temporarily the human machinery has broken down and the necessary precautions may not be observed. There may be a lapse of memory due to causes that cannot be exactly analyzed. As lives have been sacrificed in Toronto and Truro at these level crossings in the past just as surely will such losses occur in the future. If the question of expenditure is involved in providing protection, the conditions are in favour of more prompt action in Truro than in Toronto, because in Truro it is not a matter of the expenditure of millions or even of hundreds of thousands to place a subway there which will serve the public. I commend this matter to the minister as being an entirely worthy and necessary object. I only regret having taken up even this much time

of the House when I know there is a general desire that parliament should arrive at a close.

Mr. CHURCH: Might I ask the minister whether he could not arrange to be present at the proposed conference in Toronto on the matters we discussed this morning?

Mr. GRAHAM: All that I can say is that I will try to be present.

QUESTIONS UNANSWERED:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): I wish to draw attention to the unanswered questions on the order paper. It is supposed that the House will prorogue at a very early date, and unless the answers to these questions come down very soon the session will terminate without the answers being given. The question that stands in my name, number 3, has been on the order paper for a number of days. There is nothing abstruse in what I am asking, and the answer would not require to be at all long. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the Minister of Railways is anxious to give me this information; I do not think he would wish me to return to my home without receiving an adequate reply. I cannot help thinking that if the minister would instruct his department to bring these answers to the House the matter might be expedited and the necessary information given to me.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will have the matter looked into. Of course, one reason why questions relating to the railways cannot be answered promptly is, that much of the information asked for is not in the possession of the department at all, and we have to send perhaps to Halifax, or to Moncton, or as far west as Edmonton, for it. However that is not the fact in this case. I will draw the attention of the department to the matter and ask them to expedite the answering of these questions. I want to give my hon. friend the information as soon as possible.

Mr. MacLAREN: I feel that is the case. However, I should like to point out that the third question is a matter entirely within the knowledge of the government, and will not require any reference to the railway board. In that case there is no ground for delay such as was referred to by the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I might answer that question. So far as the giving to the government by the National Railway management of any assurance that unrouted shipments will be transmitted only through Canadian ports my answer to that would be "Up to the present, No."

Motion (Mr. Fielding) withdrawn.

HALIBUT FISHERY

APPROVAL OF TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to return to government notices of motion in order to take up the resolution which appears in my name with respect to the Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery treaty?

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

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

> Resolved by the..... House of Commons:—That it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America providing effective measures for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the Northern Pacific ocean, which was signed at Washington on the second day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, a copy of which has been laid before parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiary therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

He said: On March 6th, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) laid on the Table of the House a copy of a treaty between His Majesty the King and the United States with respect to the preservation of the halibut fishery on the Pacific coast. This treaty was signed on March 2nd, at Washington by plenipotentiaries representing the parties thereto. The purpose of the present resolution is to obtain from parliament approval of the provisions of the treaty. The treaty provides for a close season for halibut in the waters contiguous to the Pacific coast in the United States and in Canada. The period of the close season is three months, from November to February, to be observed over a period of five years. Either party may be at liberty, on two years' notice, to terminate the convention at any time after the five years has expired.

There is another provision in the treaty to the effect that halibut caught in those waters during the time that the convention obtains may be used for the purposes of food by the crews of vessels, fishing for other kinds of fish. If any quantity should be caught, the treaty provides that after being brought to the shore, they shall be transferred at once to officers of the Marine department of either Canada or the United States, and disposed of by those officers at such price as they may be able to obtain. The purpose of this provision is to do away with any element of profit in the catch of halibut and thereby remove all

incentive to fishing for halibut during the close season.

The treaty contains a further provision for the establishment of an International Fisheries Commission to study the life history of the halibut, and to make recommendations to the governments of the two countries with respect to measures that may be required by way of the better preservation of this important natural resource. The treaty contains a clause to the effect that the governments of the two countries shall introduce legislation to make effective its provisions.

I may say that the treaty has already been assented to by the Senate of the United States, so assented to on March 4 of this year and recommended for ratification by that body, subject to a reservation which appears in the resolution assenting to the treaty. I shall read to the House the resolution itself:

> Resolved (two-thirds of the senators present concurring therein) that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, sixty-seventh congress, fourth session, convention between the United States and Great Brtiain, signed March 2, 1923, for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the northern Pacific ocean, including the Behring sea, subject to the understanding, which is hereby made a part of this resolution of ratification, that none of the nationals and inhabitants and vessels and boats of any other part of Great Britain shall engage in halibut fishing, contrary to any of the provisions of this treaty.

In so far as we have learned the circumstances, it would appear that the "understanding" was added at the last moment, the treaty receiving the Senate's assent only on the last day of the recent session of congress. Apparently the reservation was thought necessary because of a fear expressed by a senator from one of the western states that while the citizens and vessels of Canada would be controlled ships coming from Great Britain not being included in this prohibition, their owners might feel free to fish for halibut in these waters. However, what was overlooked in that regard was the fact that legislation which will be introduced by both the government of the United States and the government of Canada to prohibit fishing during the period of the close season will provide that not only shall the nationals of the countries concerned not have the right to fish in the prohibited area but that the citizens of every country shall be prohibited from operating from a Canadian or an American base or from attempting anything by way of halibut fishing in those waters. If they are unable to find a base on the Pacific coast, either in the United States or in Canada, it is hardly likely that the citizens of any country would be able to carry on fishing operations in northern Pacific waters.

The legislation which will be introduced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give effect to the provisions of this treaty will render it immediately apparent to the members of the United States Senate that the reservation they have attached as a condition to ratification is wholly unnecessary. We feel satisfied that under these circumstances the reservation will be withdrawn and the treaty assented to and ratified as it stood at the time it was signed.

I may disclose to the House evidence of the apparent haste in which the reservation was prepared by drawing attention to the wording. It reads as follows:

> That none of the nationals and inhabitants and vessels and boats of any other part of Great Britain shall engage in halibut fishing contrary to any of the provisions of this treaty.

If the expression "any other part of the British Empire" had been used, it would not have been open to exception. However, the intention is perfectly plain, namely, that of preventing the citizens of any other part of the British Empire from availing themselves of fishing rights which will be denied the citizens of Canada by the terms of the treaty. We hold that the intention has always been that the prohibition should extend beyond the citizens of Canada or the British Empire to apply to citizens of any country in any part of the world. Such will be the effect as soon as the contemplated concurrent legislation is passed.

I need only add in conclusion that, as will be apparent from the reading of the treaty, its provisions relate wholly to matters which, to all intents and purposes, are of exclusive concern to the United States and Canada. The two countries might effect without a treaty, by concurrent legislation as is intended, practically all that is proposed here. Inasmuch, however, as it was thought advisable to have on record the understanding of the governments in this matter, the governments of our respective countries decided to have their commitments given the form of a treaty. I believe the terms proposed are so manifestly in the interests of the country that parliament will readily give its approval to the treaty.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): The motion, I understand, is a motion adopting the resolution which appears on page 5. I wish at this stage to make a very few comments on the general question, and will reserve more detailed treatment perhaps—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will allow me, it is by a clerical error that this

matter has been placed on the order paper as one to be considered in committee of the whole. It is a simple resolution presented to the House; so that if the right hon. member has any remarks to make, he should make them now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood there was an error in the order paper. I desire first of all to read the resolution, which says:

That it is expedient that parliament do approve of the treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America providing effective measures for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the Northern Pacific ocean, which was signed at Washington on the second day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, a copy of which has been laid before parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiary therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

I am not discussing at the moment anything connected with the matter of the treaty, but rather certain extraordinary circumstances that attended the preparations for and the execution thereof. These circumstances are called attention to by the wording of the resolution itself. Hon. members will observe that the resolution declares that the treaty was signed "on behalf of His Majesty the King acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiary therein named, and that this House do approve of the same." I think the records of parliament will be searched in vain for any previous reference to His Majesty the King executing a treaty "acting for" Canada by the plenipotentiary. If it is merely a misplacement of the phrase, and if the words "acting for Canada" should appear after the word "plenipotentiary"—and I really do not know why they are not there, in a resolution of such importance as this—the effect is that the plenipotentiary in the execution of the treaty acted for His Majesty the King as a representative of Canada. His Majesty the King did not for Canada. The authority given the representative of His Majesty in the document on which he bases his right to sign clearly states:

Hon. Ernest Lapointe, one of our counsel, learned in the law, member of the parliament of Canada, member of our Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Marine and Fisheries of our Dominion of Canada, have named, made, constituted and appointed, as we do by these presents name, make, constitute and appoint him our undoubted commissioner, procurator and plenipotentiary, giving to him all manner of power and authority to treat, adjust and conclude with such minister or ministers as may be vested with similar power and authority on the part of our good friends the United States of America.

The treaty undoubtedly affects chiefly the Dominion of Canada and the United States; it is an exaggeration to say that it affects solely the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Our treaty with France respecting the tariff was a treaty which affected solely the Dominion of Canada and France; there were no others directly or indirectly bound thereby, and no others affected by the treaty as such. But here the case is different. Had it been a case where we alone had been affected it is nevertheless true, and in my judgment it is important to observe that anyone named by Canada and given his credentials by His Majesty the King executes that treaty as a representative of His Majesty the King—but in respect of Canada. I observe by the correspondence that the government attempted in the first place to make the treaty without so far as the title is concerned the interposition of His Majesty at all. The treaty as submitted by the United States of America was styled in the following language:

Convention between the United States of America and Great Britain concerning halibut fishery.

In the communication from the present government to the United States, and as well in that to the British government, it was insisted that the words "Great Britain" should be changed and the words "Dominion of Canada" substituted, although every previous treaty had been made between the United States, if that was the country, and His Majesty, the King. The error of this step on the part of the present government was pointed out and they yielded the point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my right hon. friend wishes to misrepresent the facts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor have I done so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is he referring now to the nominal heading affixed to the convention, which nominal heading was drafted by the United States government, or is he referring to what is vital and material, namely, the sections of the treaty that refer to matters executive?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am referring to precisely what I said. In the title of the treaty submitted by the United States government in the first place the heading was:

Convention between the United States of America and Great Britain concerning the halibut fishery.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Which is the meaningless part of the treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister says that this is of no importance; but at the time he considered it sufficiently important to have his government address a message to the British Ambassador at Washington, for transmission, of course, in which the government

took the stand that the words "Dominion of Canada" should be substituted for "Great Britain" in the heading. The government should have known, and I think it did know, that all treaties are made between His Majesty and whatever other country is affected thereby. Pursuing the matter, and on request that credentials be given and full authority be accorded, as was quite proper, to the representative of Canada to sign the treaty on behalf of His Majesty, this authority was immediately given; and then the notification came, no doubt in the usual way, from the British Ambassador, that the terms of the treaty being agreed to on the part of the United States and Canada he was given authority to sign and was prepared to sign along with Hon. Ernest Lapointe, who had been endowed with full authority from His Majesty. This, however, appeared to affront the dignity of the government or of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) and objection was immediately taken to that hon. gentleman having anyone else sign the treaty along with him. I note, with some regret the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) from the House during this discussion. The Minister of Finance, associated with the Minister of Marine, had previously negotiated without any great success, a treaty with France, and in the execution of that treaty and in the arrangements looking to its completion they had associated with them the British Ambassador to France, as in the case of Italy, the British Foreign Minister. When the terms of that treaty were under discussion I referred to this feature of the matter and the Minister of Finance very frankly stated that he approved of the association of the British Ambassador in British treaties and of his signature thereto whether those treaties affected a single dominion or affected the Empire as a whole; and he acknowledged the great assistance given by the British Ambassador in connection with the treaty. But when it comes to this Halibut Treaty the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declines to have the British Ambassador associated with him, and in this attitude he is supported by the government. He wants the signature of the Hon. Ernest Lapointe to stand alone as executory to that treaty; and representations to this effect were made persistently both to the British Ambassador and overseas until a message was despatched by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies to this government—after very many messages had been sent across from Canada, all representing that the greatest speed was necessary and that the treaty should be signed without delay—a message, I say, was finally despatched by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in certain terms which I shall now look up. I am now turning over a multitude of pressing epistles from the present government urging the point and asking for a hurried decision. Then I come to the message to which I have referred, dated the first of March, 1923.

> With reference to your telegram of February 28 regarding the Halibut Treaty the wishes of your ministers are being telegraphed to his Majesty's Ambassador at Washington by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Not desiring to continue a somewhat undignified controversy with the Canadian government as to preserving the historic form of execution of treaties and at the same time loath to proclaim that hereafter there shall be no unity of action at all in so far as foreign policy and foreign treaties are concerned the Secretary of State for the Colonies, acting for the British government, stated merely that the British government had telegraphed the wishes of the Canadian government to the British Ambassador at Washington; whereupon the hurry of the previous weeks was consummated, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries hied himself to Washington and had the exceeding and unprecedented honour of executing this treaty alone without being impinged upon in that glory by the presence of the signature of the British Ambassador. The British Ambassadors, as do the ambassadors of all countries, in keeping with historic custom, necessarily take a special part in the negotiations for and the execution of treaties with the countries to which they are accredited, and never has any exception been asked for, never has any exception been made until we come to this occasion of the execution of the Halibut Treaty. I wonder how much better off we are. Is our autonomy in the smallest degree enlarged? Does anyone understand just how we are advantaged by the supreme glory of having the Minister of Marine and Fisheries execute this treaty alone, having, figuratively speaking, kicked the British Ambassador out of the door in the execution of a treaty with a foreign power?

All the while the reasons given by the government in the negotiations were to the effect that Canada alone was interested, that the treaty was one which solely concerned this Dominion and no other part of the Empire. And no sooner was the treaty executed than there was the addition of a clause by the Senate of the United States bringing in the subjects of the whole Empire and although

there was a fearful hurry up to the 1st March, the very stars in their courses were going—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend uses the expression that the reservation of the Senate brought in all the subjects of the British Empire. The words in the Senate reservation are, "every part of Great Britain." Does he say that this expression includes all other parts of the Empire?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly that is the intent of the Senate. Does anyone think that the Senate intends their reservation to apply to the residents of the British Isles alone, and not to the subjects of the Empire generally, as all other treaties have applied before? But the point is not of any importance to my argument anyway. The fact is that the reservation of the Senate brings in some other parts of the Empire. That is enough for my point at present. Although there was all this precipitate hurry up to the 1st March, we have since gone through nearly four months before any desire is evinced to bring forward the treaty for ratification. There has been no treaty in operation yet. I suppose the reason for the delay is because the Senate reservation completely destroyed the pedestal upon which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wished to stand. Now we are asked to ratify the treaty. We are going to prorogue this week, and we are asked to ratify the treaty and accept the devout hope expressed by the Prime Minister that the Senate will yet retrace its steps and not make any special reservation applicable to other parts of the Empire. It would have been well, I think, if the grounds of this hope had been given. I do not think that intrinsically the matter is of such colossal consequence.

I do wonder what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thought was going to be gained by this act with reference to signature by the British Ambassador which, if you do not call it discourteous, so nearly approaches discourtesy that the term applies as well as any other that can be thought of. Quite clearly the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) holds a distinctly different view, as do other members of the government. What is the intention? Is this treatment to continue to be accorded the British Ambassador? Are these petitions to the door of the British government to be made in respect of future treaties? Canada has for years been not only engaged in but in charge of all negotiations concerning the terms of any treaty in which she is specially or solely interested. All that is ever done by the British Ambassador, I presume, is to see that any proposed treaty contains no terms that affect such general policy as all parts of the Empire are interested in. This being conceded as having been the practice for years, what more do we want? Why should we continue this process of offering one affront after the other in order, if possible, to magnify and emphasize before the world our desire to dissociate ourselves from the Empire in general?

We are in something of a quandary now. We are legislating, according to this bill, against Canadian fishing even on the high seas, as to which, as it involves extra-territorial jurisdiction, we have no legislative power at all. Let me repeat: As to which, being extra-territorial, we have as yet—though I think we should have, as respects our own citizens—no authority at all. We are legislating as well that no other subjects of the British Empire shall operate there, or if they do, they cannot use our ports. In effect, we are trying now to meet the American reservation by denying indirectly the right of any British subjects to carry on these fisheries in the close season in our own as well as in extra-territorial waters.

Now, I do not deny that the objects of the treaty can only be met by making it applicable to all British subjects. Undoubtedly from the beginning Great Britain should have been associated with us, so that we would be in a position to defend our course of legislating to the best of our power to make the treaty so universally applicable. As the reservation stands, the execution of the treaty by His Majesty will bind British subjects. Is it the intention that the Australian parliament shall ratify the treaty?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what the idea of the government is in this regard. As far as this feature is concerned, I am not making any particular criticism. My criticism is directed against the unnecessary and, to my mind, indelicate action by this government with relation to the historic form of executing treaties in which this country is chiefly interested.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is in order for me to give a resumé of what preceded the negotiations which led up to the signature of this treaty. We have on the Pacific coast of this continent the greatest halibut fishery in the world, though it has been considerably diminished through over-fishing. The fishery started in 1888, and the industry has made wonderful progress in the interval, halibut being the best fish we have for shipping in fresh condition.

In 1913 or 1914 it was discovered that vast numbers of halibut go to the banks of Alaska during the winter time, and following that discovery winter fishing started on a considerable scale. To take halibut at that season of the year is especially destructive as the fish are then in a spawning condition, and from the reproduction standpoint their capture should not be allowed. Furthermore, the flesh is then in bad condition. This winter fishery is carried on at the worst season of the year, and it is then that all the accidents to the vessels occur. In addition to that, on account of the very rough weather then prevailing, the vessels engaged lose about fifty per cent of their equipment. And when it is borne in mind that the lines of every big vessel run to a length of forty-eight miles, with hooks at every ten feet, it will be realized what a heavy loss this entails, as also a loss of fish, because halibut at that time bite with avidity, and the dead fish pollute the fishing grounds.

The fisheries yield about fifty million pounds each year, of which about nine million pounds are taken by Canadian vessels, the greater proportion being taken by American vessels. But owing to the greater proximity of the Canadian coasts, seventy per cent of the fish caught by American vessels is shipped by the Canadian railways. So it is very important from many viewpoints that this halibut fishery should be protected.

In 1918 an international commission was appointed by the United States and Canada to study the condition of the fishery. At that time many special war measures were in effect in both countries, and as one of these the commission recommended the adoption of two treaties, one concerning the Fraser river run of salmon, and the other, among other things, this close season for the protection of the halibut fisheries. The first treaty was negotiated, was signed, but was not ratified by the Senate of the United States; the second treaty was drafted but was never signed. Meanwhile the fisheries authorities of both countries, though they were not in accord on some other points, were in agreement on this question of the necessity of a close season for the protection of halibut on the Pacific coast, and the suggestion was made that a special treaty be negotiated and signed to provide for that close season, quite independently of the other recommendations of the international commission. The United States government approached the government of Canada in the matter of the negotiation of that treaty; in fact, they drafted a treaty and sent it to Canada for the consideration of this government. This treaty, after the making of a few modifications, was signed, and it is the treaty which is now submitted for the approval of the House. As I have stated, it was drafted by our friends of the United States, not by us. Then, as my right hon. leader said, when the treaty came before the United States senate, a reservation was added that it should apply to the nationals of any part of the British Empire. The treaty was signed three days before the end of the term of congress; in fact, the term of congress expired the following Sunday—its last legislation was adopted on Sunday morning. The treaty was submitted in a great hurry and it is more than likely that this little rider, added at the last minute, was not given the consideration which would have been given it had the treaty been submitted at an early stage of the session.

We do not wish, after considering everything, to accept this reservation, for obvious reasons; though by the legislation which will be enacted the same purpose will be served, the same end will be reached. The legislation which both countries will adopt will make it impossible for the nationals of any country to carry on fishing operations in the waters covered by the treaty. In the first place, there is no discussion possible as to our right to prohibit halibut fishing in the territorial waters within the three mile limit; that will apply to the world. We have not the right or the power to prevent anybody from fishing in the extra-territorial waters, but it is physically impossible for any vessel to carry on halibut fishing operations in Pacific waters without using as a base either American ports or Canadian ports. So that the mere closing of our ports and the closing of American ports to fishing vessels during the close season will make it impossible for any national, the citizen of any country, to carry on fishing operations there.

Then, I may be asked, why should the reservation not be accepted? If we were to accept it we would have to submit the treaty for ratification to all the parliaments of the British Empire. We cannot bind the Australians or the New Zealanders not to fish in extra-territorial waters off our coast any more than we can bind the citizens of any foreign country not to do so; the only way that we can prevent it is by closing our ports, and this we will do. In the second place, it would be a discrimination against British subjects, against the citizens of Australia or New Zealand. But if it were possible to carry on fish-

ing operations there we should exclude them and the citizens of Japan for instance—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister goes further, if he will permit me: Will he not admit that if the treaty were ratified by the British government then it would be binding in the way desired by the reservation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he will look at section 132 of the British North America Act I think he will see that it would.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We do not want to do that. This treaty was asked for by the United States, the object being to prevent the nationals of Canada and of the United States from carrying on fishing operations during certain seasons. We accepted the treaty suggested by our friends of the United States and we are still prepared to abide by that decision. We do not want to apply the treaty to Australia, to New Zealand, to South America or even to the United Kingdom. It is a Canadian concern; we want this treaty to bind and affect Canada. As I was saying a few moments ago, if it were possible to carry on operations in those Pacific waters without the use of our ports or of United States ports, the Japanese would be far more likely to carry on fishing operations there than any citizen of the British Empire. The provision which we are going to enact and which will also be enacted by the United States will apply not merely to the citizens of the British Empire, but to the whole world. We have submitted the treaty for approval because we have reasonable expectation that the Senate of the United States will withdraw that reservation at the next session of congress. Moreover, with the legislation which we are going to enact and which will be put in force by the Governor in Council, it will be possible to reach the same end if the United States enact the same legislation, quite independently of the treaty.

Now, to come to the criticism of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). He started by commenting on the wording of the resolution submitted by the right hon. Prime Minister, laying great emphasis on that part of it which reads:

> —and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiary therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), as usual, issued a sort of challenge. I said to him once that he was strong on mistaking assertions for arguments. He issued a sort of challenge that we would in vain search the records of parliament to find such a wording. Well, Mr. Speaker, this resolution was copied word for word from a resolution introduced into the House of Commons of Canada on October 20, 1919, by the government of which my right hon. friend was a member. That resolution was introduced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs who was at that time Hon. Mr. Rowell, and it read as follows:

> That it is expedient that parliament do approve of the Convention between His Majesty and the United States of America, providing effective measures for the protection, preservation and propagation of the salmon fisheries of the Fraser River system, which was signed at Washington on the second day of September, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, a copy of which has been laid before parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting the Canada, by the plenipotentiaries therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

Of course what was legal, what was good, what was right, what was constitutional in the time of my right hon. friend becomes a crime when those miserable Liberals do the same thing.

Mr. JACOBS: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to say that there is a difference between the two, one dealt with salmon and the other with halibut.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I congratulate the hon. gentleman on getting something to the point. I take full responsibility. I had no part in it, but I had full constitutional responsibility for it. I do not think it is worded rightly, though.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend seems to think that many things that were done during his time were not right. He has to take the responsibility, but he did not tell us at the time that they were wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had not charge of it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Precedents have a great deal to do with the British constitutional system. We thought that by following the precedent created by my hon. friend's friends we were doing the right thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You usually are.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But I think we will be more careful in the future in following in the footsteps of my right hon. friend.

Now I come to the famous signature to the treaty, which has been the subject of so many comments. First let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a great misapprehension, a great error on the part of a section of the press when it stated that the mode of signing the treaty had anything to do with the reservation that was added to it. The terms of the treaty would have the same meaning, the same effect, the same result whoever were the signatories to the treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never suggested anything else in the world.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not speak of my right hon. friend now, but of the press; I mentioned that. The member of the Canadian government who signed the treaty for His Majesty the King had full authority to act in that capacity, and another signature would have added nothing nor taken away anything from the merit or demerit of that agreement. This question of the protection of our fisheries was a purely Canadian question, purely a domestic question, and the government of Canada took the position that one of its members should represent His Majesty in the negotiating and signing of this treaty. Is that a crime? If it is a crime I confess that I am an unrepentant sinner. Our action in this regard is in line with the logical and natural sequence of the principles which have been asserted and accepted by all responsible authorities in the British Empire for the past few years. Nowhere, perhaps, are those principles more clearly asserted than in the memorandum circulated on behalf of the Dominion prime ministers in March, 1919, which I take from the British Year Book of International law for 1922-1923, page 32. The Canadian Prime Minister and the prime ministers of all the Dominions subscribed to that memorandum. Here is the language of that memorandum:

> All the treaties and conventions resulting from the Peace Conference should be so drafted as to enable the Dominions to become parties and signatories thereto. This procedure will give suitable recognition to the part played at the Peace Table by the British Commonwealth as a whole, and will, at the same time, record the status attained there by the Dominions. The procedure is in consonance with the principles of constitutional government that obtain throughout the Empire. The Crown is the Supreme Executive in the United Kingdom and in all the Dominions, but it acts on the advice of different ministries within different constitutional units; and under Resolution IX of the Imperial War Conference, 1917, the organization of the Empire is to be based upon equality of nationhood.

That is a fine principle and I accept it entirely as far as I am concerned. May I quote an extract from a despatch of the Canadian cabinet dated the 4th of December, 1918, to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, then in London. I take this despatch from Mr. Rowell's book "The British Empire and World Peace"—page 176:

> Council is of opinion that in view of war efforts of Dominion other nations entitled to representation at Conference should recognize unique character of British Commonwealth composed of group of free nations under one sovereign and that provision should be made for special representation of these nations at conference.

My hon. friends opposite at that time were proud of saying that they had achieved a new status for Canada, that they had taken a step which placed Canada in the family of the nations of the world. We heard that many times in this House. As a matter of fact, Canada at the Peace Conference was represented an entity as were the other Dominions of the Empire, and the Peace Treaty was signed for Canada by Canadians appointed and having their authority to act as such by His Majesty the King.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And associated with another signature representing the British Government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: For the United Kingdom and the British Empire. For Canada they acted alone. They signed alone for Canada. The treaty says so, and my right hon. friend knows it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that.

Mr. McMASTER: Did they not also sign under order in council passed by the Canadian government and despatched to the Old Country?

Mr. LAPOINTE: So we were told, and I think it is so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Now, by the League of Nations, which was constituted by that very treaty, Canada was given separate representation. Canada has a distinct representation on the League of Nations, we are an international unit, and Canadians should not be ashamed of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the hon. member who is objecting to separate representation either in relation to this treaty or in relation to the other?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend has objection—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —to a Canadian signing a treaty for Canada—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —authorized by His Majesty the King, without having somebody to witness his signature and endorse it. I do not. What did those hon. gentlemen say after this was done? This is an important question. Perhaps I am speaking too long, but this is history, and I think—

Mr. BOYS: Smile, though.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will keep smiling. That has always been my habit.

Mr. BOYS: You were not smiling five minutes ago.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But I come back very easily to my natural mood. Here is what Sir Robert Borden said in an address on the British Commonwealth of Nations before the American Historical Association at New Haven on the 20th December, 1922. I have the address itself which I understand was published in the Yale Review of last month:

> The Dominions, as signatories of the Peace treaty, became members of the League of Nations and acquired at least vis-à-vis the other members of the League of Nations, a distinctive international status that they had not previously possessed. In accordance with constitutional usage the Peace treaties were submitted to the parliament of each Dominion for ratification, which did not take place until after the approval of each parliament had been secured.

And the Hon. N. W. Rowell, one of the ministers at the time, says in his very interesting book "The British Empire and World Peace," page 179:

> This is a great step in advance and opens the way to the Dominions obtaining full satisfaction of their national aspirations within the British Empire, just as the United States obtained the satisfaction of her national aspirations without the Empire.
>
> The only important nations which have not so far recognized and accepted this principle are the United States and Russia. Russia is not a party to the Treaty and has not been called upon to consider the question, but when she does one need not apprehend any dissent from her; there remains only the United States.

Now, I claim that by signing and accepting the signature of Canada on that treaty the United States have recognized the international status of Canada, and it should not be the part of Canadians to criticize that status.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me. Why did he permit the British Ambassador to sign the French treaty?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should my right hon. friend dodge the question all the time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why are you dodging this question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why speak of the French treaty now? I am discussing a treaty with the United States to which my right hon. friend has objected.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You are dodging the question, but pretty clumsily.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is all right. Now, I have given the opinions of two members of the Canadian government of that time. I see my hon. friend (Mr. Boys) watching me; let me assure him that I am still smiling.

Mr. BOYS: I am watching.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have given the opinions of some of our distinguished public men who were members of the government at the time. May I now give the opinion of constitutional authorities on the new status acquired by the Dominions. I have here an extract from an article in the British Year Book of International Law for the year 1922-23, by Dr. Malcolm M. Lewis, lecturer on international law in England, page 33. It says:

> This process was carried a step further in the procedure adopted for securing ratification of the Treaty, which was debated and approved by each Dominion parliament and was ratified for it, not on the advice and responsibility of the government of the United Kingdom, but on the advice and responsibilty of the Dominion government concerned.
>
> The Dominions consolidated their newly acquired international status by becoming, and being recognized as, original members of the League of Nations. They are entitled to the same representation in the Assembly of the League as sovereign states, and there is no legal obstacle to one or more of the Dominions being elected to the Council of the League as the representatives of the Assembly. In fact, as far as the League is concerned, they have the same rights, and duties, as independent states, and these rights and duties are increased by the fact of their being appointed Mandatory States over certain former colonies of the German Empire. The Union of South Africa has been given a "C" mandate for German South-West Africa, New Zealand for Samoa, and Australia for certain islands in the South Pacific. It is significant that these mandates were received by the Dominions direct from the Secretariat of the League of Nations, and correspondence thereon is not being conducted through the Imperial government. That this is a deliberate policy is shown by the fact that New Zealand wished to take her mandate through the Imperial government, but in consequence of the attitude adopted by South Africa and Australia all the mandates were issued direct. The dominions concerned are, therefore, responsible for their mandates not to the British government but directly to the League of Nations.
>
> As original members of the League of Nations the dominions are also members of the International Labour Organization for which provision was made in the various treaties of peace. As such, they are entitled to direct and separate representation at all general International Labour conferences, and at the three conferences already held they have not only availed themselves of their right to be represented, but have, on occasions, indulged in cross-voting both amongst themselves and with the representatives of the British Empire.

Dr. Keith, another authority on constitutional law, says in his book "War Government in the Dominions," page 155:

> In one point only did the proceedings in the matter of signature and ratification vary from the forms which would have been employed had the dominions been independent states; the Dominion plenipotentiaries were nominated and authorized to act for the dominions by their governments, but they received formal full powers to treat and sign from the King on the advice of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the royal ratification for the Empire was signified on the advice of the Secretary of State.

What is the difference between the procedure, as demonstrated by Professor Keith in this article, and the procedure which has been

adopted in his treaty? The same author, at page 156 of the same book, says:

Each of the units is a member of the League in its own right, possessing one vote in the Assembly of the League, and the right to be represented there by not more than three delegates. The covenant, moreover, recognizes the possibility of other dominions or colonies attaining membership of the League, and treats them as units of international law, possessing international obligations.

Now, what is the opinion of British statesmen on that subject. May I quote Mr. Lloyd George. I take his words from a recent book, "The Constitution of Canada," by Mr. W. P. M. Kennedy, page 370. On the subject of the Imperial Conference of 1921 Mr. Lloyd George spoke as follows:

He expressed himself satisfied with the progress achieved through full and free consultation between the prime ministers. He welcomed the idea of a Canadian minister at Washington. He emphasized that the dominions had been accepted fully into the comity of nations by the whole world, and that they were equal partners in the dignities and the responsibilities of the British Commonwealth, with "liberty as its binding principle. . . . based not on force but on goodwill and a common understanding."

I have here the words of Mr. Bonar Law, which are perhaps more emphatic than those of Mr. Lloyd George, but I do not like to weary the House by too many quotations. I will quote the words of Lord Milner, which appear in "Canadian Constitutional Studies," page 114;

The only possibility of a continuance of the British Empire is on a basis of out-and-out equal partnership between the United Kingdom and the Dominions. I say that without any kind of reservation whatsoever. It is very easy to say that; but undoubtedly the working out of it in practice without bringing about the severance of relations between us and the dominions will be one of the most complicated tasks which statesmanship has ever had to face. I am not afraid of it, and yet I have to admit that the difficulties are such that our best efforts may end in failure. I hope not. At any rate there is no other way out.

The new status of the Dominion is further exemplified in a recent act of the British parliament, the constitution of the Irish Free state. In the treaty between Ireland and the United Kingdom no mention is made any longer of the British Empire, but of the British Commonwealth of nations, and here is the oath that is taken by the members of parliament of the Irish Free state under that treaty—

I do solemnly swear true faith and allegiance to the constitution of the Irish Free state as by law established and that I will be faithful to His Majesty King George V, his heirs and successors by law, in virtue of the common citizenship of Ireland with Great Britain and her adherence to and membership of the group of nations forming the British Commonwealth of nations.

Professor MacNeill, K.C., in the Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law, page 53, says:

[Mr. Lapointe.]

The establishment of the Irish Free state preserves to Ireland her position and indefeasible status as an independent nation and her entrance into the British Commonwealth of nations as an equal member of that commonwealth confirms and strengthens the status of each member of that commonwealth as an independent nation, "in the fullness", to use the words of Mr. Healy, the Governor General, "of partnership in liberty with the nations co-operating in equal membership of a great commonwealth of free peoples".

Now, Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend said that it was the first time such a thing had been dreamed of. I think I have shown that at the Peace Treaty, in the negotiations for the League of Nations, in everything that pertains to the League of Nations, the Dominions act on their own behalf. But, Sir, I have here the text of the Royal treaty of the convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, signed at London, January, 1914. It was an international convention, signed by many countries of the world. Great Britain signed, through many gentlemen who are mentioned Lord Mersey was the president of the British delegation. For Australia Captain R. Muirhead Collins signed, and for Canada Mr. Alexander Johnston, General Director of Marine and Fisheries, signed. I understand this is mentioned by Mr. Keith in his work on Dominion governments. At the Radiotelegraph Conference in 1912 the delegates sat there and signed alone for their dominions, as the British delegates signed for the rest of the British Empire. In order to show that we have not done anything so revolutionary in that matter, may I say that what has been done has been according to the practice of Canadian statesmen in the past. I have here the text of a resolution moved in the House of Commons in 1882 on April 21st, 1882, by the Hon. Edward Blake, who was certainly a good Britisher and a good constitutional lawyer, and what was the motion moved by Mr. Blake? It was as follows:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, that Canada no longer occupies the position of an ordinary dependency of the Crown; she numbers four million of free men, trained in the principles of constitutional government; she comprises one-half of the North American Continent, including seven provinces federally united under an Imperial charter, which recites that her constitution is to be similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom; and that she possesses executive and legislative authorities over vast areas in the Northwest out of which one province has already been created, and in time others will be formed.

Then the resolution reads:

That it is expedient to obtain all necessary powers to enable Her Majesty, through her representative, the Governor General of Canada, acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, to enter by an agent or representative of Canada, into direct communication with any British possession or foreign State for the purpose of negotiating com-

mercial arrangements subject to the prior consent, or the subsequent approval of the parliament of Canada signified by act.

I call attention to the fact that Mr. Blake advocated a step which was going much further than the one which my right hon. friend objects to. He moved that Canada should be represented in the negotiations of its treaties for Canadian people by the Governor General of Canada. Sir Richard Cartwright on the 18th February, 1889, moved the following resolution:

That it has become a matter of extreme importance to the well-being of the people of this Dominion that the government and parliament of Canada should acquire the power of negotiating commercial treaties with foreign states.

That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty praying that she will empower her representative the Governor General of Canada, acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, to enter, by an agent or representative of Canada into direct communication with any foreign state for the purpose of negotiating commercial arrangements tending to the advantage of Canada, subject to the prior consent or subsequent approval of the parliament of Canada, signified by act.

In 1891 the Hon. David Mills, who was subsequently Minister of Justice, moved the following resolution:

That all the words after the word "that" be left out and the following inserted instead thereof:

"It is expedient to obtain the necessary powers to enable Her Majesty the Queen through her representative the Governor General of Canada upon the advice of his ministers, to appoint an agent to negotiate commercial treaties with other British possessions or with foreign states, subject to the prior consent or subsequent approval of the parliament of Canada.

Let me quote the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he introduced the Naval Service Act in 1910:

This policy is in the best traditions of the Liberal party. This policy is the latest link in the long chain of events which following the principles laid down by the reformers of the old times, Baldwin and Lafontaine, step by step, stage by stage have brought Canada to the position it now occupies, that is to say the rank, dignity and status of a nation within the British Empire.

As I am quoting from distinguished men, I wish to quote words from my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). In a speech which I admired very much, delivered by the right hon. gentleman when he was overseas in 1921, and which is published in his "Overseas Addresses," I find the following at page 15:

We legislate each for ourselves unfettered; we advise through separate councils a common sovereign; we confer together in order better to understand the wider overriding common interest; between a sense of independence and a sense of unity there is no clash but harmony. On these principles our own league of nations has survived, and it has served the world wonderfully well.

These are fine words, but surely they must not be merely words; we must act upon them. But I find other words of my right hon. friend. I find them in Sir Robert Borden's book "Canadian Constitutional Studies" at pages 113 and 114. Sir Robert Borden says:

In May, 1921, the Canadian Prime Minister, in the Manchester Guardian Centenary number, May 5, 1921, declared that the relations between the constituent parts of the Empire must be based upon a conception of complete freedom and equality in national status. Further he observed that the practical need would be met by clearly understood and definitely acepted declarations of principle in so much of the form and content of the existing mechanism as may be found to be obsolete.

These, too, are fine words, and I think we acted in perfect harmony with the doctrine laid down by my right hon. friend in the position which we took in the present case. My right hon. friend declares that we were guilty of an act of discourtesy. I believe he said it was an affront; at least, it was an act of discourtesy towards the British Ambassador in Washington. Well, Sir, surely when a man is twenty-one years of age, as my right hon. friend has stated so many times that this nation is, it is not discourteous on his part to sign his promissory notes without asking his former guardian to sign with him. Is an obligation of the Canadian government to enforce regulations in Canada invalid, not binding, because it is not endorsed? We are not living in 1830; this is 1923 and everybody in this country should bear that in mind. But, Sir, I say that it was not an act of discourtesy; rather, I think it was an act of gracious courtesy on the part of his Majesty the King, to appoint Canadian men to sign Canadian treaties on his behalf. Far from impairing the unity of the Empire it strengthens it, it exemplifies it, while recognizing the autonomy of every part of the Empire.

I have heard somewhere or read in the newspapers, the silly argument that because we have not a strong navy and strong military forces we should not sign treaties. Mr. Speaker, Canada is much stronger than most of the independent nations; and force is not the only criterion of national status. We need no navy. After all, what have we done? We have contracted by this treaty to fulfil certain obligations, and we need not have any navy to fulfil our obligations. If we do not fulfil them we shall deserve whatever may come to us. Everything that has been done in Canada, and in every part of the British Empire for that matter, looking in the direction of responsible government and nationhood has always been assailed as a dangerous step; every move which has been made in this country in that respect has been made against the will

and despite the clamours of those who are apprehensive of the future and imagine destruction and separation ahead. But, Sir, the fuller the liberty that has been given the greater the unity of empire that has been accomplished. Why, when the government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman accorded responsible government to South Africa the action was attacked in the British parliament as a foolish one. I have here the words of a great and distinguished British statesman, Lord Balfour, who at the time assailed the action of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman as the most reckless experiment that political folly had ever conceived. Yet, Mr. Speaker, that folly is accepted to-day as having been the greatest piece of wisdom that Great Britain could have displayed in that day. We need not be afraid of having more liberty provided we maintain unity; and this all Canadians desire. In conclusion, I say that the treaty which is submitted for the approval of the House has the same force, the same strength, the same validity, being signed by a Canadian, as it would have if signed by anyone else.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I am reluctant to say anything after the very eloquent and able address we have heard from the other side of the House; I rise merely to associate myself with the ideas that have been expressed. I do not think there is an hon. member in this House who is not a perfectly loyal and true Canadian; and whatever little differences there may appear in our expressions of that loyalty, I am inclined to think that ultimately it will be found that our views are essentially the same. As one who was not born in the Dominion of Canada I rejoice in the fact that step by step this young country is attaining to full national existence, a nation free and equal with other nations in the commonwealth. There is one encouraging circumstance that predominates in all the events that have taken place, and it is this, that with every apparent slackening of the legal bonds that unite the various parts of the Empire there seems to be a proportionate increase in strength in the common loyalty and in the other high sentiments that are, after all, more truly representative of "the ties that bind." I fully realize that there may be some difficulties ahead of us; no doubt there will arise some troubles which it will be difficult to solve. But knowing the temper of the people of Great Britain, their generosity, their freedom-loving spirit, knowing the loyalty of Canadians and their faith in their own young nation, and believing in loyalty to that common Crown to which we all pay fealty, I have no fear for the future. We know that no young man ever reaches the full stature of manhood until he has taken upon himself the responsibility and duties incident to manhood. And so shall it be with a nation. Until we too are ready and willing to take upon ourselves the responsibilities and duties of nationhood, Canada can never attain to that position which she should rightfully occupy. I repeat that I am only too glad to associate myself with the idea of Canada as a free and independent nation—a nation co-equal with her sister nations in the commonwealth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking any part in this debate, but I am impelled to do so from the happy position which I find so many members apparently to be in. Only the other night the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in connection with votes of public moneys and the like said that what was wrong when he was in opposition is right when he is in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says what is deliberately untrue when he makes that statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will leave it to Hansard. My right hon. friend said, "Certainly, there was another government—"

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: So there is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was another government then, and the answer made to his own argument, as read by me, was that to-day there is another government. Yes, there is another government to-day, and we are finding that while our friends across the aisle laughed at the Conservative government when it claimed that Canada had arrived at nationhood, to-day they are loudly proclaiming the very same doctrine. Why, those of us who were in the House at that time can recollect that we were told it was absolutely unnecessary for Canada to consider the terms of the Peace Treaty. Eloquent speeches were then delivered by our friends opposite, as members of the official opposition at that time, that it was entirely unnecessary for us to consider the terms of the Peace Treaty, that Canada was still a colony, not a nation. That is what a considerable portion of my hon. friends opposite then asserted.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member would be too fair to imply that all or nearly all, the speeches then delivered were of that character?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, I have not gone the length of saying everyone said so. I stated that a considerable portion of my hon. friends opposite held those views at that time, and that eloquent speeches were made and applauded to the echo just along that line. Why, I remember very well the eloquent speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) calling the government to account and holding it up to ridicule—for what? Simply because the administration of that day made the very claim which my hon. friends opposite now so fondly hug to their hearts. The whole truth is, we are talking to-day about something that should not be discussed at all. There is no issue on that head between us.

Mr. VIEN: Who started it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, some hon. gentlemen seem to want to say something. I have not the slightest objection to answering any questions, but I think we might have interruption from one quarter at a time.

Mr. VIEN: If my hon. friend will allow me—he stated, "We are talking to-day about something that should not be discussed at all." My remark was that he was the man who started it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said that things were being talked about which there was no necessity to discuss—for instance, this very question as to nationhood that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) has said so much about. And the reason I say so is that my hon. friends over there are all converts. The former administration had no doubt whatever as to the absolute freedom and independence of this country—of our nationhood. There is only one issue that will ever arise between us and our friends across the aisle on this head, and that is as to how those rights should be exercised; that is, as to what partnership means. There is the only difference. My hon. friend referred to the statement of Lord Milner on the question of partnership. He is absolutely right. What is the function of a partner? Is he to co-operate with his partners, or is he to look upon himself as having absolutely nothing to do with the partnership? Surely partnership means something. The only trouble, I think, we are ever likely to have with our friends opposite is this. We have the conviction that the force of this country can be best exercised in the closest co-operation with other component parts of the British Empire. We have the conviction that the British Empire is strong when it acts as a unit. This argument as to our rights being called in question is entirely beside the issue. There is no question about it. I honestly and thoroughly believe that Canada is, as is admitted now by everybody, a free and independent nation within the British Empire. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at all ashamed of the title, "British Empire," and do not want any substitute. The British Empire has stood for a lot, it has meant a lot, and it is going to mean a lot in the future.

Mr. VIEN: What about Canadian?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend suggest that there should be a Canadian empire? I wonder what the meaning of the interruption is?

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend is criticizing the government for the elimination of the British Ambassador at Washington from the signing of the treaty. Then my hon. friend says that we have obligations as partners within the British Empire. I ask him—and my remark was to this effect—whether this partnership is to go as far as the elimination of the identity of the representatives of the Canadian nation when signing a treaty on behalf of Canada?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the principles enunciated to-day by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not pay much attention to the ambassador's signature one way or the other. We had an absolute right to sign the treaty ourselves; but, as the hon. Minister of Finance said only the other day, it is a good thing to have a British signature on a treaty, that it did no harm and certainly lent dignity and strength to the treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend mean to say that the signature of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not a British signature?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is not going to get me into a debate on a question to which I have already said I attach no importance. Rather I attach importance to the trend of view of the government, not as expressed here, but as to its logical conclusion.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend says that he is not concerned with the question of the signature at all. Is not the whole question raised by the right hon. leader of the Opposition about the elimination of the British Ambassador in the signing of the treaty?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, I I think I had perhaps better try to answer one question at a time.

Mr. VIEN: It is one question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was asked a question by my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, before, and I dealt with one from my hon. friend who has just spoken when he asked me something about "Canadian." Now, the position of the Canadian people as I see it is just this, that the Canadian people are absolutely free and independent, and that the first duty that the Canadian people owe not only to the British Empire but to Canada, is to Canada itself, is to have Canada just as strong and as free and as efficient as we can turn Canada into. That is what I think about our Canadian situation. But I also think that besides that first duty to Canada, that the best future not only for Canada but the best and greatest future, yes not only for the British Empire too, but for civilization in this world is that Canada ought to continue to act not as a unit but as a partner in a real partnership, that our influence for good and for peace is infinitely stronger if it be in joint union with the other kingdoms of the British Empire. I am convinced that there is something in unity, that there is still a whole lot in tradition, that there is still a whole lot in the different races of which this country is composed, that to-day we ought not to try and think that everything of the past should be discarded, but rather we should use this new nationhood of ours in such a way as to make better and stronger and more efficient the greatest influence for good that the world has ever seen—the British Empire.

Mr. VIEN: In what way did the signing of this treaty by Canadians hamper the work that my hon. friend now advocates or hamper our progress?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have much pleasure in again answering my hon. friend, for the third time now I think upon this particular issue. As I said before, I see nothing wrong in that signature as an isolated act. I see a great deal of good, though, in keeping in touch with British channels. They are ours just as much as they are British. We have a British Ambassador at Washington, and he is ours just as much as he is British, just the same.

Mr. VIEN: Would my hon. friend allow me a further question? If the British Ambassador is just as much our ambassador as that of the British Empire why did my hon. friend and his colleagues when in power negotiate to appoint a Canadian Minister at Washington?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very glad my hon. friend has brought that up. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) very justly pointed out that things have been done in the past for which we had to take governmental responsibility. He will also bear with me when I say that constitutionally, that government no longer existing, I standing here to-day on my own responsibility have a right to my own views. I want to tell my hon. friend this, that although that provision was made there was never an appointment made. Personally I think there ought to be no appointment made, and the money should be saved. Why is there no appointment made to-day? I am inclined to think that the real reason why it is not made to-day is that the government have been listening to the wise counsels of the hon. Minister of Finance who spoke so very, very strongly against that question of separate ambassadorship. I am inclined to think so. Following the subject that my hon .friend has given me, there is one way that we could get every benefit without cost and without any possible fear of entanglements one way or the other, and that would be if this government were to request the British government, and I have no doubt they would do it, to appoint to some high office on the staff of that embassy a Canadian who could be particularly charged with the carrying on of our business.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: As an assistant?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if my hon. friend thinks there would be any harm in a Canadian working for the British Empire?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is not the question at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If he does not think that, what is the force of his question? I may be wrong—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hon. gentlemen laugh. I have never claimed infallibility at any time. We have heard some claims in that direction, but I have never claimed it. I still think that it is a good deal better that there should be one ambassador at Washington representing the whole of us than that there should be an ambassador representing the Mother Country, and one for each of the Dominions, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, the Irish Free State and India.

Mr. HOEY: Following out that argument would the hon. member be prepared to advocate the appointment of a Canadian British ambassador at Washington?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would be very glad to do it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that owing to the fact that we are so near, that so much of the business is Canadian business with Washington, that that would be a very proper solution of the whole question.

Mr. McMASTER: Would my hon. friend go further and suggest that it would be a wise thing to have a British assistant to the Canadian ambassador?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would say to the hon. member for Brome, it might be; I do not know. We might have such a good man that he would not require any assistance at all. But really, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this is a matter to laugh over. It is a serious question. It is a matter which in the long run may have a great deal to do with the future efficient functioning of the British Empire. We ought not to laugh at it.

There is just another thing I would like to say in connection with the subject while I am on my feet. Most of our interests and most of our troubles with the United States are entirely financial; I do not mean financial in its narrow sense but in the broad sense of the word—trade questions. We are anxious to get business from them, and there is almost always something on which Canadian business interests could be helped. There are really few of those matters which involve diplomacy at all, one way or the other. Our business interests have little to do with diplomatic matters. They are business questions, the matter of getting trade and that sort of thing, and really what we want at Washington is not somebody who can make a great speech on a constitutional question like my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), but what we really want at Washington is a first-class business representative. That is what is required, and that is something which can certainly be done at any time without any trouble one way or the other.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will acquit me of any intention of speaking at any length. I hope you will have observed the fact that most of my remarks to-day have been provoked by questions from hon. gentlemen, and I apologize for taking up the length of time I have with this impromptu statement.

Mr. RENE MORIN (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, after the eloquent and exhaustive speech which has been made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) on this important question it ill becomes a modest back bencher to take part at some length at this eleventh hour of the session in the discussion of this resolution, but the subject is to my mind a most important one and I believe that the arguments to support the stand taken by the government have not been exhausted. I shall therefore take the liberty of giving my views to the House on some of the points that have not yet been touched upon.

There is first a very strong argument to make it seems to me, in reviewing the development which since confederation has marked the evolution of our international relations. I will, however, relieve the House from this historical development because while it is an argument that may have some value in itself it is not very conclusive. There is, however, an appreciation of this argument which I find in a book recently published by Mr. Porritt, entitled "Fiscal and Diplomatic Freedom of the Overseas Dominions," where he makes this appreciation of these developments:

> There is no law on the statute books of Westminster to support the existing diplomatic freedom of the dominions. It is a freedom, however, that may now be said to be recognized and guaranteed like so much else in the polity of Great Britain and in the polity of the Empire, by usage or the law of the constitution.

The strongest argument that I intend to make derives in my humble judgment from the position that Canada has taken in the Treaty of Peace and in the League of Nations. When the Treaty of Peace was signed at Versailles each of the self-governing dominions was represented by special delegates, distinct from those of Great Britain, having received their full powers directly from the King, on the advice of the Dominion cabinet, and acting separately each for his local government, as a separate entity.

When the League of Nations was formed, the self-governing dominions claimed and obtained the recognition of a distinct status, giving them an international existence, and were admitted into the league as separate states on the same footing as all the small independent nations, and were allowed their representatives as all the other members, the sovereignty of which was not controverted.

It may be said that from that moment a status separate and distinct from that of the Empire as a whole was fully recognized as appertaining to the dominions by the government of Great Britain and by the foreign nations which entered the League. Who will hold now when Canada has entered the

League of Nations as a separate entity on a footing equal to that of other full sovereign states with her distinct representation that she should not necessarily enjoy a status and a diplomatic freedom enabling her to act alone in her intercourse with foreign nations in all matters which are her exclusive concern?

No one at the time thought of denying the dominions this new status which they had fully earned by their sacrifices for the cause of the Empire. It was recognized by all the leading statesmen of the Empire. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given quotations from Lord Milner and Mr. Lloyd George. I have another one here which I think is most important from Lieutenant-Colonel Amery then Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and now First Lord of the Admiralty. In a speech in the House of Commons on the 30th of July 1919, he was still more explicit. He said:

> That which has most impressed the outside world is the fact that at that conference—Paris—the full equality of the dominions with ourselves as nations, has been recognized not only by us but by the other governments. They have been treated not only as equal nations within the brotherhood of the British Empire but as equal nations with other nations outside the Empire and I know that there are some timid imperialists, I might perhaps call them, who think it is a beginning of the end of any effective imperial unity. My conviction is exactly to the contrary; I have always been convinced that closer imperial unity could only be based on the recognition of the fullest equality of status between ourselves and the other dominions of the Empire.

In the dominions expression is given to the same sentiments. You hear General Smuts in an address to the people of South Africa declare that

> The dominions have in principle authority and power, not only in respect to their domestic questions but also their international or foreign relations and. . . the questions of peace or war which may affect them. If a war is to affect them they will have to declare it; if peace is to be made in respect of them they will have to sign it. Their independence has been achieved.

This change in our status is to-day sanctioned by international law. In addition to what has been quoted by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries may I quote from Oppenheim's International Law, third edition:

> But the position of self-governing dominions underwent a fundamental change at the end of the world war. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and also India were not only separately represented within the British Empire delegation at the Peace conference, but also became, side by side, with Great Britain original members of the League of Nations. Separately represented in the Assembly of the League they may, of course, vote there independently of Great Britain. Now the League of Nations is not a mere administrative union . . . . but the organized family of nations. Without doubt therefore the admission of these four self-governing dominions to membership gives them a position in international law.

[Mr. Morin.]

Now all these declarations were accepted in Canada and elsewhere as a recognition of a new order of things. This progress in our constitutional development is largely due to the untiring efforts of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and of the then Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Robert Borden; and the leaders of his party after him on many occasions emphasized this progress in this House particularly on the question of the ratification of the Peace Treaty and on that of the appointment of a Canadian Ambassador at Washington.

Is it possible in the face of all these developments of our constitutional rights, when we are told and we claim that we have acquired complete nationhood; that we are on an equality of status with any other part of the British Empire; that a partnership now exists between the different parts of the Empire—is it possible to maintain the practice of having our treaties, concerning our own particular commercial interests, having no relation whatever to any other part of the Empire—made in the name of Great Britain signed by the British Ambassador or ratified by the Crown on the advice of the Imperial cabinet?

To keep up such a practice is in my humble opinion absolutely inconsistent with the position which Canada now occupies in the family of nations and in the league; it is incompatible with the status that has been accorded to Canada; it would be a retrograde step injurious to those who have been the protagonists of our constitutional progress, and unworthy of our national dignity.

We have entered the League of Nations with our distinct representatives entitled to vote independently of those of Great Britain and even adversely to them. It is a position in which we necessarily find ourselves because if it was otherwise, the other nations by allowing the dominions a distinct status in the league, would merely have been granting Great Britain the right to have four times as many delegates in the assembly as any other member of the league, and it is not to be presumed that it was their intention to do so.

If, after having assumed that stand, we must in our diplomatic relationships with other countries, in matters relating exclusively to Canada, act as if we were in tutelage, appear only accompanied by our guardian, and become bound by our contracts only if they are made with the authorization of the Mother Country and signed by an Imperial delegate, distinct from the Canadian diplomatic envoy, is there a nation which will not think that Canada entered the League of Nations under false pretences and for no other

purpose than to increase the British representation? Since we have agreed to enter the League of Nations, we are in honour bound to act as if we enjoyed complete diplomatic freedom and should get rid of all formalities which would imply a state of subordination and dependence. We are in association with the commonwealth of British nations but this should not prevent us from acting in accordance with our views and singly in matters which concern us alone. We may keep the Imperial government posted on our external relations; we may, and should, abstain from doing anything to damage or affect our co-partners, we may, and should, take the advice of the Imperial cabinet in all matters which have any bearing on the Empire at large, but all these are matters to be settled between ourselves.

In our dealings with foreign countries, regarding matters which affect Canada alone, we must act on our own behalf—without the participation of any tutor or guardian—under powers derived directly from the Crown, on the advice of the Canadian cabinet or parliament. To do otherwise would be to acknowledge a state of subjection incompatible with the status which we now occupy in the League of Nations.

Since the League of Nations was formed, Canada has tried to live up to her new status. When the Disarmament Conference took place at Washington in November, 1921, no invitation was sent to the dominions. The British government decided to appoint some representatives from the dominions, and was proceeding to appoint the delegates suggested by the prime ministers of the dominions when General Smuts protested against this procedure in a telegram addressed to the Canadian Premier on October 19, 1921, in which he says:

> Agitation in congress against our independent voting power in the League of Nations was a direct challenge to new dominion status. It is first great international conference after Paris and if dominions concerned are not invited and yet attend, it will be a bad precedent and dominions' status will suffer. If a stand is made now and America acquiesces battle for international recognition our international status is finally won.

A copy of this telegram was sent by him to the British Premier Lloyd George, who acknowledged the truth of the statement in a wire to the Canadian Premier on 21st October, 1921, wherein he said:

> I am completely in accord of course, with his (Smuts) view that dominion representatives should hold the same status as at Paris.

To which message Mr. Meighen replied on 27th October, 1921:

> Essential that Dominion representatives should hold same status as at Paris and that this status must not be allowed to be prejudiced by proceedings at Washington Conference.

As it was then too late to start negotiations for a direct invitation, the procedure concerning the nomination of the Canadian representative was altered to the extent that he received his full powers from the Crown, by direction of an order in council of the Canadian cabinet, and not from the imperial cabinet. The effect of the protest was noticeable, however, at the Genoa conference which took place a few months after, when, in January, 1922, the invitation was addressed directly by the Italian Ambassador to the Prime Minister of Canada.

There is no doubt in my mind, that under her new status Canada can act alone in her dealings with foreign countries in all matters of exclusively local interest, and this view is supported by an authority like Oppenheim, who states in the volume from which I already have quoted:

> International negotiations can be conducted by all such states as have a standing within the family of nations. . . It would be wrong to maintain that states which are not fully sovereign can never be parties to international negotiations on those points concerning which they have a standing within the family of nations.

And further he says:

> Not full sovereign states can become parties only to such treaties as they are competent to conclude. . . Ordinarily a vassal state can conclude treaties concerning such matters as railways, extradition commerce and the like.

Now, what are commercial treaties? The same author thus defines them:

> Commercial treaties are treaties concerning the commerce and navigation of the contracting states and concerning the subjects of those states who are engaged in commerce or navigation.

Undoubtedly the treaty which we have before us falls within these categories, and should have been made exclusively in the name of Canada.

It is an agreement which, to have any effect, must be implemented by local legislation. My contention is, that under the present constitution, as it has developed since confederation, Canada has sole and exclusive jurisdiction to pass legislation to give effect to that treaty. If Canada alone could give effect to that treaty then it necessarily implies that Canada alone could make it, and that it should not only have been signed by the Canadian plenipotentiary alone, but should have been made in the name of the Dominion of Canada.

There was another reason in this particular case why the Canadian government should assert its right to act alone. The American

government only of all the nations which have participated in negotiations which led to the formation of the League of Nations, has refused to recognize the right of the dominions to a separate and distinct representation in the league, and this opposition to dominion representation was one of the grounds upon which the United States senate rejected the league. Under these circumstances the Canadian government was well inspired in insisting that the treaty should be negotiated directly by Canada and the United States, without the intervention of the British Ambassador, because this new procedure involved, to a certain extent, the recognition by the United States of our new status, and it would have been a mistake to allow the occasion to pass without taking advantage of it.

This is in accordance with the rules of international law. Oppenheim says on this point:

> A permanent diplomatic envoy needs no other empowering document than his general letters of credence, if he is not entrusted with any task outside the limits of the ordinary business of a permanent legation: but in case he is entrusted with any such task, as for instance if any special treaty or convention is to be negotiated, he requires a special empowering document, namely, "full powers."

It therefore follows that the full powers having been issued to the Canadian Minister of Marine, no other authority was required.

The action of the Canadian government in abstaining from requiring the signature of the British Ambassador, as had heretofore been the practice, did not mean any lack of consideration or courtesy to him. It was in duty bound to claim and assert the right of Canada to act under her own exclusive authority in the negotiation of her treaties. That was one way, and perhaps the only way to maintain a stand in full accord with the new position this country occupies within the comity of nations.

Some timorous people are inclined to dread the consequences which such a policy may have on our relations with the Empire. They say that the adoption of such a policy would bring about the disintegration of the Empire or would disrupt it, and that it is equivalent to a declaration of independence. As a matter of fact, I believe that is the only argument which may be brought forth against these views. But in Canada we are getting used to this argument, and experience has taught us that there is not much in it. As far back as 1837 the question of responsible government for the colonies was agitated At that time there were very strong objections to such a policy, and Lord John Russell, then Prime Minister, had recourse to this high sounding argument when he wrote:

> It is proposed that the executive council should be made to resemble the ministry in this country. I hold this proposition to be entirely incompatible with the relations between the Mother Country and the colony. The relations between the Mother Country and the colony require that His Majesty should be represented not by a person removable by the assembly but by the governor sent by the king responsible to the king and to the parliament of Great Britain. This was the necessary constitution of a colony, and if you have not these relations existing between the Mother Country and the colony you will soon have an end to the relations altogether.

A few years after responsible government was granted to Canada and the relations between the two countries were not affected in any way. Later, in 1859, when Galt increased the duties on British manufactured goods imported into Canada, the same argument was advanced. The Sheffield manufacturers in a memorial contended that:—

> The policy of protection to native manufacturers in Canada should be distinctly discountenanced by Her Majesty's government as a system condemned by reason and experience as being directly contrary to the policy solemnly adopted by the Mother Country and calculated to breed disunion and distrust between Great Britain and her colonies.

The firm answer of Sir A. T. Galt is well known. He said:—

> Self-government would be utterly annihilated if the views of the Imperial government were to be preferred to those of the people of Canada. It is therefore the duty of the present government distinctly to affirm the right of the Canadian legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best, even if it should unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the Imperial ministry. Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such acts unless her advisers are prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony, irrespective of the views of its inhabitants.

It was this stand which finally won for Canada absolute fiscal freedom, and yet no disruption or disunion followed.

Again, you may recall the answer of the Marquis of Ripon to the demand of the colonies at the conference of 1894 to negotiate their own commercial treaties when he said that:

> To grant such a right would be equivalent to breaking up the Empire into a number of independent states.

The power to negotiate treaties was conceded to Canada in 1907 and the fatal results which were predicted did not materialize in this case, any more than in the others. We are justified in stating that not only is such an argument without foundation, but the reverse proposition is nearer the truth—that the greater the freedom granted to Canada the firmer are the ties which bind this country and Great Britain together. To-day

these ties are apparently so elastic that on the 30th of March, 1920 in the British House of Commons the Right Hon. Bonar Law could say:

> There is not a man in this House who would not admit that the connection of the dominions with the Empire depends upon themselves. If the self-governing dominions, Australia, and Canada chose to-morrow to say: We will no longer make a part of the British Empire, we would not try to force them. Dominion home rule means the right to decide their own destinies.

And yet these ties, elastic as they are, are so strong that in the first days of August 1914, when war was declared between Great Britain and Germany, all the self-governing dominions, without being bound or even called upon to do so, but simply by a movement of their own free will, without hesitation, without discussion, flew to the side of Great Britain and fought with her, till final victory was won. Would Canada have made the sacrifices which she did make in this war if she had been compelled by a superior authority to take part in it? I believe not. No, Mr. Speaker, the argument that Canada cannot expect to enjoy a measure of sovereignty which will entitle her to make her treaties in her own name, to appoint her own commercial plenipotentiaries acting under powers derived from the King on the advice of his Canadian cabinet, without endangering the unity of the Empire is a pusillanimous one and must be set aside.

Now Mr. Speaker, some may find that I have been rash in my statements. I may have scared the "timid imperialists" of this House if there are any, but I think that we might as well face the situation squarely. At all times has our constitutional development pointed towards the goal which we have now reached; our position to-day, as I have outlined it, is the logical conclusion of the claims and actions of the former governments and of the former leaders of this House. When one studies the political history of Canada during recent times, he is astonished at finding to what extent the successive Premiers of Canada of both parties were of one mind in claiming for Canada, larger and larger powers, more and more liberties in her dealings with other nations. This movement for larger and more complete liberty has taken a new impetus on account of the war, and now I claim that Canada, by her sacrifices during the war; on account of the economic crisis through which she has to trend as a consequence of her participation in the war; by the efforts and foresight of her leaders, has acquired a status equal to that of the other small nations which compose the family of nations. I claim that this status has been acknowledged by the British government, by foreign nations and that she must not do anything which may be of a nature to prejudice that status; that on the contrary she must, on every occasion assert her right to full and complete sovereignty in her dealings with foreign nations in all matters which concern her alone.

By doing so her position in the comity of nations shall become more and more exalted and the ties which bind her to Great Britain will in no way be affected: if anything they will be strengthened because associations founded on freedom and natural inclinations are more solid and more durable than those founded on the domination of one partner and the subordination of the other.

Our actions in this respect are only in line with the aspirations of our forefathers who, as far back as 1851, in the platform of the Reform party claimed that:

> Canadian commerce and commercial intercourse with other nations, should be under the control of the legislators.

They would be in accord with the conception of our aspirations, as set forth by a famous statesman Lord Elgin, who in 1850 declared that he conceived it his mission:

> "To convince Canadians that without severing the bonds that united them with Great Britain, they might attain the degree of perfection and social and political development to which organized communities of freemen had the right to aspire."

If we are freemen our aim can only be freedom; freedom in our internal affairs, freedom in our commercial intercourse with other nations, the fullest freedom consistent with the maintenance of our association with the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I am thoroughly in accord with what the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) stated to-day, and I am also in thorough accord with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, (Mr. Lapointe). I go further and I state my justification in a few words, by quoting from two of our poets. Tennyson says that the constitutional development of our country and of our Empire

> broadens slowly down
> From precedent to precedent.

It is a constitutional advance which can be justified by every Canadian, by every other nation or British commonwealth. I wish to quote from another poet who says:

> Daughter am I in my mother's house,
> But mistress in my own.

I wish to say, in regard to the future of the world, that Canada is the equal of a benign mother in this regard. As far as this con-

tinent is concerned—and this continent has the making of a future world above any other, or equal to any other country—I say that Canada is here to stay by the grace of the United States, if they choose to accord it; but in spite of the United States if we must. When we are on this continent, the equal of any nation or power, we have the right to make our own treaties concerning this continent. We are the equal of the United States or any other nation in making treaties for ourselves, That is in line with what has been quoted here to-day from Canadian statesmen and from British statesmen, time after time. I am glad to see that almost the unanimous opinion of this House is that Canada has at least reached a national status, and that fact is recognized in the House and still more in the world at large.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Prime Minister replies the debate will be closed; so that if any hon. member wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say at once, that after the comprehensive, eloquent and convincing address made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), and after the remarks of the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) and the scholarly and informative address of the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Morin), I hesitate to avail myself of my right to speak again. Were it not that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), in the course of his remarks, made one or two statements which I think should not be permitted to go wholly unobserved, I would not attempt a further reply. The first comment which my right hon. friend made on the action of the government was in the nature of some exception to the wording of the resolution as it had been given the House. My hon. friend read the resolution and quoted these words—

> The treaty was signed on behalf of His Majesty acting for Canada by the plenipotentiary named therein.

He took exception to the particular phrase "acting for Canada," coming after the words "on behalf of His Majesty." He said he thought that was not the proper order of wording, that the phrase, if used at all should have come after the word "plenipotentiary." When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries cited to him the wording of a treaty for which the government of which he was a member was responsible, my right hon. friend remarked that he did not think the wording was right, and he went on in characteristic fashion, to add, that he was not at that time in charge of matters himself. In view of my right hon. friend having claimed that when he is in charge whatever he does is correct, he will, perhaps, permit me to read to him an order in council passed at the time he was Prime Minister, and for which he himself was responsible. I am not at all sure that the order in council was not drafted by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister, might have added that I stated that I took the full constitutional responsibility for the order in council. I thought I was rather frank in doing so. I do not know why he criticized it. Whether I drafted it or not, I took the full responsibility.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my right hon. friend will take full responsibility for the order in council which I am about to read.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There have been several treaties in the making of which Canada has had a part. There were several treaties which grew out of the war and which were signed at Versailles, and there were treaties signed at Washington, after the conference on the Limitation of Armaments. The representative of Canada at Washington was the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, formerly Prime Minister of this country. Sir Robert was appointed representative by His Majesty the King on the recommendation of the government of my right hon. friend opposite. In preparing the order in council recommending that full power be given Sir Robert Borden as the representative of Canada at the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments, my right hon. friend used language which I think deserves to be quoted here. Sir Robert Borden has thought it of sufficient importance to direct the attention of the country to it in the report of the conference which he prepared for presentation to this parliament. At page 43 there will be found the following statement by Sir Robert Borden:

> For convenience of reference I also set out herewith (2) the text of the order in council sanctioning the issuance by His Majesty the King of the Full-Power necessary to provide me with authority to sign, "for and in the name of His Majesty the King in respect of the Dominion of Canada", such treaties as might be concluded at the conference—

Exactly the form and order of words to which my right hon. friend takes exception.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a better expression; clearly it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, Sir Robert Borden will no doubt be pleased to learn that the right hon. gentleman thinks the language he used is superior to that of his former leader. The order in council itself appears in the document at page 143. It is dated Thursday, the 27th day of October, 1921, at which time my right hon. friend was in office as Prime Minister. I think I had better read the entire order in council as it has a bearing on the present case. May I say that the present government, in the drafting of the order in council referred to in the resolution, followed verbatim et literatim, with the exception of the names, the wording of the particular order passed by its predecessor.

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on a report from the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, submitting that it is expedient, in connection with the forthcoming conference on the Limitation of Armament and on Pacific and Far Eastern questions, summoned by the government of the United States to meet at Washington on November 11th, 1921, to invest fit person with full power to treat on the part of His Majesty the King in respect of the Dominion of Canada with persons similarly empowered on the part of other states, is pleased to order and doth hereby order that His Majesty the King be humbly moved to issue letters patent to the Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird Borden, a member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, G.C.M.G., K.C., naming and appointing him as commissioner and plenipotentiary in respect of the Dominion of Canada with full power and authority to conclude with such plenipotentiaries as may be vested with similar power and authority on the part of any powers or states, any treaties, conventions, or agreements in connection with the said conference, and to sign for and in the name of His Majesty the King in respect of the Dominion of Canada everything so agreed upon and concluded and to transact all such other matters as may appertain thereto.

I think, when we realize that the procedure in international matters respecting treaties was gone into very carefully by Sir Robert Borden and those associated with him at the time, our government might have justly been held remiss had we without good cause taken what I might describe as a backward step in asserting the manner in which this country should be represented in negotiating a treaty which has to do solely with its neighbour and iteslf.

The next point my right hon. friend ventured to criticize was a change in the wording of the draft. Nothing appears to have been too small for him to call attention to. The wording to which my right hon. friend has directed the attention of the House appeared as the heading of the draft which was sent by the United States government to the Canadian government for consideration. This heading was in the following words:

Convention between the United States of America and Great Britain concerning halibut fishery.

When the draft was presented in that form our government took the view that the convention was not between the United States of America and Great Britain, but between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Great Britain does not covenant to do anything by this convention. It would have been quite as appropriate and accurate to have stated that the convention was between the United States and South Africa, or New Zealand, or Australia, or Ireland or any other part of the Empire, as it was to say that it was between the American government and Great Britain. Had the American government wished to make reference to the British Empire as a whole the term "British Empire" might have been used. But the entire treaty has relation to the question of fisheries on the Pacific coast of the United States of America and of Canada, and the convention in that respect was therefore one between the United States and Canada. I might point out that the present government was not the only government that drew attention to the apparent error which had been committed in that regard. The British government were kept in touch with the negotiations and were asked for an expression of view on any phase of the proposed agreement. I will read the following telegram which was sent from His grace the Duke of Devonshire, the Secretary of State for the Colonies in Great Britain, to his Excellency, the Governor General. It is dated London, February 15, 1923:

Your telegram January 16th and your despatch January 24th,

Full powers for Mr. Lapointe sent by mail February 13th.

As regards text of draft treaty, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs suggests following modifications:

(1) Title of treaty to be Convention for the Regulation of Halibut Fisheries on the Pacific Coast of Canada and the United States.

That is the title the British government suggested should be given to the convention between the two countries.

(2) In accordance with the usual treaty practice title of his Majesty preamble to read "His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India."

Do your ministers see any objection?

It will be observed that the British government itself recognised that the convention related solely to Canada and the United States, and was careful in suggesting an appropriate designation to bring in the names of these two countries, making no reference to Great Britain or to any other part of the British Empire. Why does my right hon.

friend not take exception to the British government having ventured to make specific reference to Canada?

My right hon. friend had a word to say about preserving the historic form of the execution of treaties. I think I have already pointed out wherein the present government has sought to preserve what has come to be the accepted form in the making, signing and ratifying of treaties affecting different parts of the British Empire. The leader of the opposition suggested there had been some discourtesy; that the British Ambassador at Washington had been overlooked. I will not take up the time of the House to read the entire correspondence, but if anyone will peruse the communications that passed between the several governments he will observe our government was most careful to point out that it was as respects Canada that the signature of the Minister of Marine was desired. We were careful to point out that the treaty had to do entirely with a matter of concern to Canada and its neighbour to the south. We did not at any point say that the British government might not, if it thought desirable, ask the British Ambassador at Washington to sign. We did not say that we would take exception to his signing. What we did do was to point out that, the treaty relating as it did to Canada and the United States exclusively, it was not necessary, in our opinion, that more than the signature of our own minister, who had been given full powers by his Majesty the King, should appear on the agreement I might quote a paragraph from the communication referred to by my right hon. friend, which was despatched on February 28, from His Excellency the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

> My ministers are of opinion that, as respects Canada, the signature of the treaty by Mr. Lapointe alone should be sufficient.

And elsewhere:

> The view of my ministers, however, is that the treaty being one of concern solely to Canada and the United States, and not affecting in any particular any imperial interests, the signature of the Canadian minister would be sufficient, and they would respectfully request that his Majesty's Ambassador at Washington be instructed accordingly.

What does that language mean? It means by implication that had any Imperial interests been concerned Canada would have expected the British Ambassador as well as her own minister to sign the agreement. But inasmuch as the treaty related exclusively to a Canadian matter, inasmuch as it had no bearing of an Imperial character, we felt it was unnecessary in the circumstances that the British Ambassador should place his signature beside that of the minister who had negotiated the treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was there any imperial interest affecting the French treaty that does not affect this one?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Every treaty has, I think, to be considered in the light of the circumstances under which it is negotiated, and of which proper and full account should be taken. In negotiating the commercial treaty with France, the Canadian ministers, I think, used to a considerable extent the good offices of the British Ambassador at Paris. They were in a foreign European country, the British Ambassador lent his good offices in furthering the negotiations, and while there was no obligation, whatever, necessitating the signature of the British Ambassador, it seems to me wholly appropriate that under the circumstances he should have been asked by our ministers to join with them in signing the convention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does my right hon. friend mean by "good offices?" What good offices were exercised then that were not similar to those offered in this case? I should like the Prime Minister to be more specific.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it will be quite evident that negotiations with the United States, owing to the proximity of Washington and Ottawa, can be conducted by ministers and officials in a way in which it is not possible to carry on negotiations of a diplomatic character between Ottawa and some European capital. As I say, each case must be considered on its own merits.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the point I am raising at all. One may be verbally negotiated, the other may be written. But what good offices were necessary in the negotiation of the French treaty that were not necessary in these negotiations?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I have answered my right hon. friend. It is not a question of what was necessary, but what in the circumstances was appropriate. I would say in this connection, that in previous negotiations with France, my right hon. friend's minister had associated himself with the British Ambassador in Paris for the purpose of concluding a temporary arrangement, to take the place of which the new agreement was intended. Under such circumstances, I think it was only proper that the British Ambassador should have been associated with the treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister not admit that this correspondence shows that the good offices of the British Ambassador were proffered and given in just the same way in connection with this treaty?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I will not admit anything of the kind. The correspondence speaks for itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The correspondence discloses this.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to enter into a verbal discussion with my right hon. friend at the moment.

As to the "preservation of the historic form of execution of a treaty," which is the phrase my right hon. friend uses, without attempting in any way to set forth what in the opinion of the government is the proper recognition to be given different parts of the British Empire in matters of the kind, I should like, speaking for myself personally to quote from an article by Sir Robert Borden which has recently appeared, as expressing, in the paragraph which I am about to read, my own views as to the present position with respect to treaties of concern to Canada, and the course of action appropriate in respect thereto. In the Yale Review for this month there appears an article by Sir Robert Borden entitled, "The British Commonwealth of Nations." On page 12 the article contains references which have already been quoted by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe). In a copy of this article which has been sent to me by, I think, Sir Robert Borden himself, I find inserted the page which I have in my hand, with the following note at the head:

> The following paragraph was inadvertently omitted by the Yale Review. It should appear on page 12 at the place indicated.

The place indicated is at the end of the sentence quoted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This is Sir Robert Borden's view of the present position in the matter of treaty-making so far as Canada is concerned.

> Since the beginning of the present century Canada has in many instances negotiated treaties that concerned her special interests. In such cases the diplomatic unity of the commonwealth is preserved by the form of the treaty and by the method of execution and ratification.
>
> The King is named in the treaty as the High Contracting Party and the execution is under powers issued by him upon the recommendation of the Dominion government. Ratification takes place also upon the recomendation of the Dominion government; but any relevant question as to the effect of the treaty upon the commonwealth as a whole must naturally be the subject of consultation between the governments concerned prior to ratification. It is not improbable that in this respect usage, arising out of practice and experience as to the proper character, method and extent of such consultation, will develop into a recognized convention. There seems no reason to desire or to anticipate any modification in the form of such treaties. The ancient formula by which the King is designated as the enacting authority still subsists in the statutes of each dominion and in those of Great Britain; in form the King, in reality the legislature, enacts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me direct attention to these words, "The king is named in the treaty as the high contracting party." That is precisely what we have in the treaty which the House is now considering. The treaty is between His Majesty the King, and the United States. "Its execution is under powers issued by him upon the recommendation of the Dominion government." There appears in the correspondence which lies on the Table of the House a copy of the order in council under which the Dominion government asked His Majesty the King to give full powers to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to act in his name in the negotiating and signing of this treaty The government in so doing acted with a full sense of its responsibility to this parliament. The power rests here with parliament. It is this parliament that in reality is enacting this treaty. It is enacting the treaty through the recommendation made by the ministry in office to-day, which is responsible to parliament, and which has made its recommendation to the king, which recommendation the king has accepted and on which action has been taken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister had better be a little more accurate in that regard. Does he wish to convey the impression that the king acted upon the advice of this government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I am perfectly accurate, Mr. Speaker. I say the king's action in this regard was based upon the recommendation of this government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister did not say so. It was the commencement of the negotiations that led to the king's action. But the advice tendered His Majesty to act would be the advice of the British government, of his own ministers, and this government communicated, not with His Majesty, but with the British government and got it to give that advice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is resorting to the kind of hair-splitting of which he is so fond.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, this is very important.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The essential thing so far as this parliament and country is concerned is that this government made a certain recommendation to the king. It may be asked: How that recommendation was transmitted, and in what form it was sent? It was sent to His Majesty's ministers in Great Britain and transmitted by them to the King.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With their advice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I am prepared to say, "with their advice." Which shows that they approved entirely of the action to which my right hon. friend now takes exception.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is taking exception to the fact that the Canadian minister signed this treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am not, and I will not permit the Prime Minister to misrepresent me. I object to no such thing. Nor did I object to the recommendation made to the British government for transmission to His Majesty with their advice. It is the proper method. I entirely approve of it, and I entirely approve of the appointment of the Canadian minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then what is my right hon. friend objecting to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I did object to was the change in the usual practice and the refusal by this government to permit the British Ambassador to be associated in the execution of the treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have made it plain that the usual practice, at least in the view of the one member of the Privy Council who has the largest experience, is that as respects matters affecting Canada, a Canadian minister should sign on behalf of His Majesty and be given full power for that purpose, That practice was established by the conference at Versailles and by the Disarmament Conference at Washington.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister give me an instance where the British ministers did not sign as well?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They did not sign the Peace Treaty on behalf of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say for Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Those were matters of general and Imperial interest in which all parts of the Empire were concerned.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The French treaty?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The present treaty is not a matter which is of imperial interest; it is primarily of concern to this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister permit an interruption, not a question? He says they were matters of general and imperial interest; surely he does not mean that. I do not wish to be always harping on the French treaty, but will he say that that treaty is of more imperial interest than this? Or the Italian and other treaties? Or the treaty negotiated four years ago with France? All those are as distinctly Canadian as this one. I wish the Prime Minister would not make such general remarks without being careful as to their real significance.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not say it is a question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, it is a lecture.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know my right hon. friend is a little restive. He realizes the position he is in, and is simply trying to extricate himself as best he can.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not at all. Try to be fair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to leave it at that. So far as the government's action in this matter is concerned, far from there being any desire or intention in any way to overlook the British Ambassador, the chief and sole aim was to preserve the recognition of the status of Canada as one of the self-governing dominions of the Empire and those full rights of autonomy and responsibility which she has acquired and which during recent years have been so often referred to by her public men.

I shall conclude with one further reference to a remark of my right hon. friend. He said that he could not understand why there was this desire—and he applied his words to this treaty—"to dissociate ourselves from the British Empire." I think I am quoting my right hon. friend correctly in that remark.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not quite sure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very glad my right hon. friend is not quite sure, because I regard his remark as thoroughly disloyal, I marvel at any leader of any party in this House venturing to say that the government was seeking to dissociate itself from the British Empire.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say anything of the sort. The Prime Minister is imagining it in order to get an excuse to work up his heat. If the Prime Minister will take my remarks as they appear in the typewritten transcript of Hansard, and will wait until eight-thirty to-night, I shall be prepared to stand by the report of what I said.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have the very words of my right hon. friend. I quote his words as I took them down. He said he could not understand why there was "this desire to dissociate ourselves from the British Empire." That is the sort of expression my right hon. friend is fond of using when he does not think he will be brought to book for it. I tell my right hon. friend that the government, in the action it was taking, far from being prompted by a desire in any way to estrange Canada from the Empire, believed that its action was calculated to strengthen the faith of Canadians in the greatness of the Empire, and to increase the respect which all other parts of the Empire and other countries have for Canada.

I wish to quote again words of Sir Robert Borden from the article to which I have referred. At page 15, Sir Robert says:

> I am of those who believe that the essential unity of the commonwealth has in no sense been diminished by its development into an organization which is virtually a Britannic League of Nations.

That at all events is the position which we on this side of the House take. We believe that the more the British Empire comes to be understood as a Britannic League of Nations, the more serviceable it will be to its component parts and to human society in general, and the more likely will it be to endure on a permanent basis. It is as a part of a league of Britannic nations, as one of a community of sister nations within the British Empire, that we have taken a course which we believe will afford recognition to that particular status. There never has been a time when the assertion of her autonomy by Canada has not been followed by some protest from one quarter or another. We believe that the more self-government is realized in all its phases, the more enduring and permanent will be the basis of the Empire.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes strongly in that community of free nations which comprises the British Empire, and I hope to live to see that community of nations grow stronger from year to year, and as time goes on to mean more and more to our great human society. I believe that in the British commonwealth to-day, we have the greatest example the world has ever known of a community of free nations in the nature of a League of Nations which is an inspiration and a model to the League of Nations itself. As the British Empire endures so will the League of Nations prosper on similar foundations of liberty and freedom, and consultation and co-operation between component parts. It is because I want to see the British Empire endure, it is because I want to see all its parts work together in closer harmony and co-operation—because I believe it is the greatest agency which the world has ever had for the preservation of freedom, liberty and justice—that I hope every effort will be made upon the part of each free nation of the British Empire to see that in the matter of self-government, it exercises to the full the rights which are conceded to it, as being a component part of the Empire. In that way it will help to illustrate and make for that freedom, justice and co-operation among the nations of the world which we pray all may come to practise and enjoy.

I shall conclude with but one further quotation. On the 24th of May, His Majesty, the King, addressed a message to the school children in all parts of the British Empire. Here are the words with which His Majesty concluded that address. They have been recorded in all the schools of the Empire:

> Get knowledge, be brave, honourable and kind, thinking of others before yourselves, and always play the game. So will you fit yourselves to hand down this community of free nations to your children and grandchildren as a great instrument for justice, peace and goodwill, which will deserve the respect and esteem of mankind.

I submit Sir, that we will not find anywhere a truer and nobler expression of what the British Empire is than in those words of His Majesty, wherein he speaks of it as a "community of free nations." If we are a community of free nations, is it to be said as my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), has suggested with respect to the signing of a treaty affecting Canada but not affecting any imperial interest, that there is no question as to the right you have; you have the right but you must not exercise it? Mr. Speaker, we have passed that stage. We want not only the right, we want also to exercise our rights. We believe that in the exercise of all our rights we will gain more of strength and of influence as a nation; and, so far as the British Empire is concerned, we believe that its greatness will be proportionately greater as our strength and influence as a country increase.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Lapointe; that a message be sent to the Senate to inform Their Honours that this House has passed the following resolution:

Resolved by the..... House of Commons:—

That it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the Treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America providing effective measures for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the Northern Pacific Ocean, which was signed at Washington on the second day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, a copy of which has been laid before parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiary therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

and requesting that Their Honours do unite with this House in the said resolution by filling up the blank therein with the words, "Senate and."

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

HALIBUT FISHERY

CLOSE SEASON FIXED FOR CANADIAN TERRITORIAL WATERS

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

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

That it is expedient to bring in a measure for the protection of the Northern Pacific halibut fishery, and to provide:

1. That a close season be established during which it shall be unlawful for any person to fish for, catch or attempt to catch halibut in the territorial waters of Canada contiguous to the western coast of Canada, or for any national or inhabitant of Canada to fish for, catch or attempt to catch halibut in the territorial waters of Canada aforesaid, in the territorial waters of the United States contiguous to the western coast of the United States, in the high seas extending westerly from the limit of the territorial waters of Canada and of the United States, also Behring Sea.

2. That making use of a Canadian port to outfit a vessel to engage in prohibited fishing, or permitting the departure of the same with intention to engage in such fishing, or entering any port in Canada while prosecuting a voyage to fish for halibut or with halibut intentionally caught in the close season, shall be an offence against the proposed legislation.

3. That the vessel, cargo and outfit operated or used for the purpose of committing an offence against the provisions of the proposed legislation shall be liable to seizure and forfeiture, and if such vessel is the property of a national or inhabitant of the United States or is registered in the United States the same shall be delivered as soon as practicable after seizure to an authorized official of the United States to be dealt with in accordance with the laws of that country.

4. That foreign ships found fishing or preparing to fish for halibut in such territorial waters shall be liable to seizure and to be forfeited, and that certain provisions of the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act be made applicable for the purposes of the proposed legislation.

5. That the Governor in Council may join with the government of the United States in appointing an International Fisheries Commission, consisting of four members, two to be appointed by the Governor in Council and two by the government of the United States, such commission to exist for a period of five years, and thereafter until two years from the day when either of the constituting governments shall give notice of desire to terminate it, and Canada shall pay the salaries and expenses of the members of the commission appointed by the Governor in Council, and one-half the joint expenses incurred by the commission.

6. That the Governor in Council may make regulations for giving effect to the recommendations of the commission, and to give full effect to the provisions of the proposed act, and such regulations may create offences and impose penalties, and that the said act shall come into force on a day to be named by the Governor in Council, and may be repealed by the Governor in Council at any time during the existence of the International Fisheries Commission.

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

On paragraph 1.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the general clause of the resolution. I do not wish to take the occasion to make any particular speech but to correct some misrepresentations of the speech I made, if you call it a speech, on the motion itself. I did not realize that I had committed such a grave attack or propounded some new and dangerous theory affecting our autonomy such as called for the long volley of reply that came from hon. gentlemen opposite. I did not know that my innocent remarks were really worthy of a whole afternoon of thunder from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), from the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin), and finally from the Prime Minister.

I have not any accusation of misrepresentation, certainly not of deliberate misrepresentation, to make against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think that so far as he referred to my own remarks he was quite fair. All I have to say about his reference to them is this: He seemed to assume, and he seemed sincerely to assume, that my objection was to the fulness of Canadian autonomy and the fulness of Canadian national rights, that I harboured in my heart the idea that domination from Britain would be advisable. There were protests in his speech repeatedly against some theory of domination, and these were re-echoed in very scholarly language indeed by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville. No one in this country would resist the going into effect of any such theory or idea more determinedly than would I. The thought of domination

has long since ceased to be in the mind of any practical person or any prominent person in public affairs in either Britain or Canada. The talk of domination is only for the purpose of rearing something that can be struck at with venom, vigour and indignation in order, if possible, to gain applause. I have been accustomed to this sort of attack. No matter what I say, however clearly I say it and however simple and indeed axiomatic it is, it is always followed by representations wherever it will be believed they will pay, that I have delivered a ringing, imperialistic harangue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear. Could I receive a better confirmation of what I have stated? Already it is declared by the "hear, hears" that I have delivered such a speech this afternoon.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now I place myself in the hands of the House. I wonder if hon. gentlemen will not realize what has been the basis of the campaign when the speech I made this afternoon is rejoiced in by hon. gentlemen opposite as giving them an opportunity once more to impale me before certain portions of this country as a wild and blood-thirsty Imperialist. I have not the least doubt that there will be newspapers in the near future, and one of them edited by an hon. gentleman opposite which will declare to their readers that I preached domination by Britain over the affairs of Canada. I ask hon. gentlemen now to be good enough to watch as I will do myself, and read with great interest the editorial attacks that will follow. But I am accustomed to it. I have become accustomed to it through many years.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is my hon. friend referring to La Minerve?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not know that La Minerve was edited by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret): I thought it was Le Canada.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I thought my hon. friend referred to La Minerve.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman did not think so at all. He thought he had a joke, but in such view he was mistaken. I was glad to hear the quotations made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries which constituted a large portion of his address and certain of them, I think constituted by far the best portion of his address.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear. That is what I thought too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The modest views of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries agree with my own. With those quotations enunciated I have no quarrel whatever; with some of them I had to do at the time of their creation, but I am no more loyal to them than I am to the others. I do not know any at this day who disagree. Nothing was said this afternoon on the part of any hon. member in this House out of accord with what was quoted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, unless it was certain phrases that fell, I hope inadvertently from the lips of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin). Something has been achieved all right through these years, not against obstacles at all but simply as a matter of natural growth. Something has been achieved in that way of fuller national status for our country, fuller control over local affairs, fuller influence over those wider affairs that more and more affect us as we grow in stature and in consequence. I say again it has not been achieved against resistance. I have not witnessed nor come in contact with any resistance on the part of British statesmen or the British people—none whatever. But control of our own affairs, and increasing influence in other matters in which we are interested are quite consistent with the preservation of that co-operation and that unity upon which, at least, as much depends as upon the preservation of our autonomy.

I argued this afternoon against what I deemed an indecorous casting aside of one evidence of that unity without any purpose being served whatever, without any object being gained; nothing whatever being achieved in the way of control of domestic affairs or of control of our part in any affairs at all. Without anything to be gained I do not think it is worth while.

Now, I go further than I went this afternoon. I think his conduct has been a grave mistake, and I will tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why. In the conduct of our diplomatic affairs—using the adjective for want of a better—in the conduct of our treaty and other relations with other powers and nations of the world, it is essential, so long as the British Empire exists—whether you call it a commonwealth of nations or the British Empire; one title is as good to me as another, but the latter carries with it a tradition that I for one am not going to forget—it is going to be essential that in all these relations there shall exist harmony and a unity of purpose; in a word that

all our outside relations are harmonized so that we present to the world not a discordant but a united front. I do not mean by this a hostile front but that we present to the world the fact that we are still together, and that we are not one of us pursuing a policy which conflicts and discords with the policy of the other. The means we have adopted in the past of doing so have been to associate with us in the maintenance of our outside relations the appropriate representative of the British government; and by means of such association we take care that we are not entering into covenants or commitments at variance with policies which, although they may be general, though they may be of British rather than Canadian origin, are nevertheless of consequence to us the same as they are of consequence to Britain. Such association we have always preserved, and I want to know what the reason is for not having the preservation of that association attested by the signature of the British representative? Would it not be better in later times, if anything should arise which would make it appear that we possibly had given cause for embarrassment in connection with other affairs to the British Empire, to be able to point to the signature of the British representative as attesting not only consent or approval, but rather attesting the fact that there is nothing within the four corners of the treaty that is in any way detrimental or embarrassing to other interests of the Empire?

Mr. VIEN: Does my right hon. friend mean thereby that a few matters concerning Canada alone should at all times receive the rubber stamp of the British Ambassador?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not referring to rubber stamps at all. Matters concerning Canada alone, purely domestic matters never have; but in the case of matters affecting the relations of this country with other countries it is better to have the attestation of a representative of Britain; because though they may appear—and though doubtless they often are—what one may call the sole concern of the Dominion it is not for us alone to say that such is the case. There may be others concerned, although, perhaps, not nearly so much concerned as we are; there may be other relations affected besides our own. Can we stand up and say to all the rest of this Empire "This is our concern and our concern alone" when the matter affects relations with an outside nation? If this is to be done hon. gentlemen say we still preserve unity? I do not know just what hon. genlemen are willing to preserve. What is there left to preserve if we are to make—as stated for example by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville—what treaties we like, or as he expressed it, make treaties between the Dominion of Canada and foreign nations in absolute diplomatic freedom, to use his exact words. If we act in this way I ask again, what is there left to preserve? You may preserve a feeling. But a feeling may exist between any other country and the United Kingdom but, in a word what is there to preserve if there is not diplomatic unity to preserve.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my right hon. friend intend to start the debate over again? This is entirely out of order. I do not want to interrupt my right hon. friend but the treaty has been approved. Discussion of the signature to that treaty has nothing to do with the legislation now before the House. There is no question of the treaty in this legislation. We are asking merely the right to close our ports and impose penalties in the case of persons fishing in our territorial waters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that I have not the right to start the debate over again, and I do not intend to. The extent to which I have gone is attributable in part to questions put and interruptions made. I will not proceed any further. I wanted to make my position on the subject clear. I will not start in to refute or attempt to destroy what has been said on the other side. I will make no reference to the alleged reply of the Prime Minister, inasmuch as from beginning to end it was based on a distortion of my own remarks.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 2.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to have the minister's views as to the validity of the proposed law in regard to extra-territorial rights. The committee will remember that this House passed an address two or three years ago, asking that there should be an amendment to the British North America Act giving this country the same power of legislation in personam, but in relation to extra-territorial rights or extra-territorial offences, that the British government itself possesses in relation to their own subjects. Certain objections were taken to it, but it passed this House anyway, and was forwarded, and I am not quite certain—I cannot recall definitely—as to the reasons why it has not yet been adopted; but until it is adopted, how have we the right to legislate even in personam? The minister understands me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister knows we have not the right to legislate as to what might be done by others than the citizens of Canada in extra-territorial waters. That is to say, if the offence is committed in extra-territorial waters, how can we legislate against it in the absence of an amendment to the British North America Act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I quite understand the objection. I was not absolutely sure about it; but it was referred to the Department of Justice, and the resolution and the bill have been drafted by that department. Of course, where other people are concerned, there is no doubt we would have no right in extra-territorial waters; but it seems the Justice department are of the opinion that we can deal with Canadian citizens in those waters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the only way, of course, in which we can meet the obligations under the treaty, but I am inclined to think the Justice department is taking a flyer at it —taking the chance. I suppose it cannot do any harm.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend has the opinion of the Department of Justice. Certainly the Department of Justice once upon a time had a very different view. This House adopted the resolution it did adopt as a result of the opinion of the Department of Justice. The question then arose having particular regard to aeroplanes. We became interested in offences by Canadian citizens outside of our territorial jurisdiction, and the opinion of the Department of Justice then certainly was that we had no right to create an offence, whether by a Canadian citizen or anybody else, outside territorial waters. That is why they adopted that resolution. What new light has the department got?

Mr. FORKE: If the offence is committed on the high seas, who has the right? Surely some one has.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member has not quite got the drift of this question at all. The Mother Country has the territorial rights. We have all rights given us in connection with our own land. Those rights extend to the three-mile limit. What we wanted to do—and the reason this resolution was passed before—was to put ourselves in the position of being able to police these districts. Take the case of the aeroplane. Of course the law is different in reference to ships. We need not worry about that question. We wanted the right to be able to police outside the three-mile limit.

Mr. FORKE: Does the hon. member mean to say that Canada has no control over Canadian citizens on the high seas?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, that is the whole thing; and the House adopted the resolution that we should have an amendment to the British North America Act which would give us extra territorial rights? The whole House, on the advice of the Department of Justice, was told that we had not that control. I understand my hon. friend to say to-day that the Justice department has changed its mind. I think the best way of showing how it has changed its mind would be to read its opinion. I know of nothing that has turned up in the meantime to make a change.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In answer to my hon. friend's question, the Justice department prepared the legislation. We asked the Justice department to prepare the legislation to meet the requirements of the treaty, and to prepare it, of course, according to our laws, and this is the bill and the resolution which were prepared, not by us, but by the Department of Justice.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But the instructions to the department in that case would be just the same as in any other matter. Here is a treaty; we want an act to carry it into effect and provide for it, and among other matters, we have this question. Did the minister get an opinion from the department whether that bill if enacted would be the law?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We had the opinion of the Department of Justice before the bill was prepared.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Department of Justice would never vouch that this clause would be effective. It is put there, in the hope that people would follow it, and not in the belief that we have the jurisdiction to pass it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not admit that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They gave a previous opinion to that effect.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am bound by the fact that they have presented the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say the department has expressed the opinion that this House has jurisdiction to give effect to penalties for violation of these provisions?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I say the Department of Justice prepared the bill to meet what is contemplated by the treaty. They made a difference, as my right hon. friend will see when

he has the bill, in section 2, as between the citizens of Canada and foreign citizens. In reference to territorial waters, it applies to everybody from everywhere. In extra-territorial waters it applies only to citizens of Canada, because we are supposed to have the right to prohibit only Canadian citizens in extra-territorial waters. They did this and prepared this legislation; they were asked by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to prepare legislation according to the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Justice department—poor fellows—what else could they do? Here is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries bound by that treaty to give effect to certain things, one of which the government of Canada was not in position to give effect to. That is handed to the Justice department and they are asked to prepare a law to do that. They prepare this, and it is the best they could do. Certainly I could not have done it better if I had been asked to do it. But the Justice department will not say that we have power to give effect to it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend knows that the Justice department would never lend itself to the preparation of a law which it knew to be illegal or to be one that could not be enforced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know; they might have to. What else could they do?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not a dictator to the Department of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be the duty of the Department of Justice to prepare a law to carry the treaty into effect. It is not their fault if we have not the power to give effect to that treaty; it is the fault of those who made the treaty. There are cases, which I shall not mention because I am not familiar with them, where the same thing has had to be done on other occasions; but on this occasion they could only do what they have done. The minister got them into that position.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes; and now he is making a treaty which in my opinion, as, I am sure, in the opinion of the Justice department as well, this country has no power to carry through.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 4.

Mr. STEVENS: Suppose the ships of some foreign country, say, Japan, come into extra-territorial waters off the Canadian coast, there would be no power to prevent them from fishing?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. STEVENS: In that case does the treaty purpose to restrain the nationals of Canada and of the United States from fishing, while permitting foreign vessels to engage in the business?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As I explained this afternoon, it is impracticable for foreign vessels to come and fish off the coast without using our ports, and that we can prevent them from doing.

Mr. STEVENS: I heard the minister say that but I do not agree with him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well you are wrong.

Mr. STEVENS: I know a little about this matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And so do other people.

Mr. STEVENS: The reason the Japanese do not fish halibut off the Pacific coast is that the market for this fish is in the New England states, in eastern Canada and elsewhere in America. There is a very small market for that class of fish in the Orient, where they get the cheaper fish. But within the last five years the Japanese have gone into the salmon canning business and have virtually put British Columbia and Alaska salmon off the British market. This appeared in a government report the other day and is also recorded in public statements. I apprehend that as soon as this restriction is imposed on the nationals of Canada and of the United States the Japanese will make efforts to find a market for this particular fish, because there is no difficulty in their coming across, fishing off the coast, icing the fish and taking it back to the Orient. The only trouble in their way at present is the lack of a market for this high-class fish. My hon. friend comforts himself with the thought that they cannot come and fish.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the advice of experts on the subject.

Mr. STEVENS: The opinion of many to whom I have spoken, and my opinion also, is that they will come as soon as they find a market for this fish; and I expect that to occur in a few years' time. I suggest that we should be prepared in such an eventuality to know exactly what we are going to do.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then my hon. friend is opposed to the close season.

Mr. STEVENS: No, no. The minister is misinterpreting my remarks.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no way of preventing Japanese vessels from coming and fishing off the coast if they can do so without using either our ports or the American ports. If they can come and fish under such circumstances we are unable to prevent them. Nevertheless, everybody in my hon. friend's province is asking for this legislation because it is highly important that there shall be a close season if the halibut, which are being destroyed in alarming numbers, are to be conserved. We have had representations from every source in British Columbia, and I have not heard one word against this proposed legislation and the treaty. We cannot meet the difficulty in any other way.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not for one moment suggesting that this legislation should not be passed. I merely want to know what we are going to do should foreign vessels come and fish during the close season.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have already pointed out that there is no means by which we can prevent them from coming and fishing. Perhaps my hon. friend can suggest one. We have no right to go into extra-territorial waters and stop anybody who wants to fish. If we had a treaty with the Japanese we might be able to do so, but we have not. But the advice of all experts on this subject convinces us that neither Japanese nor any other foreign vessels can carry on fishing operations in these waters which are covered by the treaty. In the extra-territorial waters our restrictions can apply only to our own citizens; similarly the American government will control its own nationals. But we believe that it is imperative that we should prevent our citizens from carrying on operations, and should make it impossible for foreigners to do the same, by closing our ports. That is the only way we can save the industry; otherwise we should have to let the halibut disappear in a very short time.

9 p.m.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 5.

Mr. STEVENS: When are the commissioners to be appointed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: When the treaty has come into force, after its ratification. They will not be appointed before next winter.

Mr. STEVENS: Not before ratification by the United States?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 247 for the protection of the Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. LAPOINTE moved the second reading of the bill.

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

On section 2—Interpretation.

Mr. STEVENS: I notice that paragraph (d) of clause 2 provides that the prohibited waters shall comprise certain waters in Canada and off the United States shore, and also the Behring sea. Why is the Behring sea included in this? It must be remembered that the Japanese, for instance, have far easier access to the Behring sea than our fishermen have.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As I said this afternoon, the treaty was drafted by the United States themselves. We were asked to include the Behring sea and I do not see any objection to doing so.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not in a position, perhaps, to offer any facts to back up what I am going to suggest; it may be that our interests there are nil. But it would appear to me as if we were legislating ourselves out of any right to enter the Behring sea, and that is not necessary for the purposes of this treaty. It must be remembered that one has to go away round the Aleutian islands, a couple of thousand miles or more from Prince Rupert, to approach the Behring sea, which is not near the halibut fisheries at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What will be the harm in including it if it is not near the halibut fisheries?

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot tell my hon. friend what the harm is unless he can tell me why it is in here. To me it is a purposeless thing, unless the United States government had some reason for putting it there.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think myself that it serves a very important purpose, but I would not like to add a rider or reservation to the treaty to exclude the Behring sea. As my hon. friend himself says, the inclusion of the words "Behring sea" cannot have any effect, because there are no halibut there.

Mr. STEVENS: What I meant was this: The present halibut fisheries, so described, lie off the Queen Charlotte islands and the panhandle of Alaska, the southern narrow strip

of the Alaskan coast running down the British Columbian coast. Up to the present the halibut fishing in the Behring sea has not been developed, but I am not so positive that there are no halibut there; it looks as if some information that we are not possessed of induced the American government to include the Behring sea in the treaty. It will certainly give a distinct advantage to the Japanese. If there is any need for including the Behring sea, in the absence of any other information we must assume there are halibut there, and if that is the case the Japanese will have access to those fisheries while we have not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend may be sure that neither the United States nor Canada have entered into this treaty and have included the Behring sea for the benefit of the Japanese. I do not think the United States are trying to facilitate matters for the Japanese and to enable them to fish in their waters, any more than we are doing in our own waters. This is an honest effort to provide a close season and to prevent American and Canadian fishermen from destroying the halibut. Both countries have for years been trying to arrange this close season and the treaty has been drafted in such a way as to cover all possibility of fishing in violation of this close season.

Mr. STEVENS: Virtually the minister's answer to my question is that he does not know why the Behring sea is included.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Just to make sure that we shall have a close season wherever there is a possibility of halibut fishing being carried on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there not a danger in including the Behring sea? On the Atlantic I would not see very much danger so far as the extra-territorial waters are concerned, but in Behring sea you are very close to Japan, which is a fishing nation. Is not the ultimate effect just going to be to make the Behring sea a fishing preserve for the good of Japan alone? The minister says the United States would never do that. Well, what is the good of this parliament ratifying the treaty if we are only going to be able to plead in defence of our wisdom that we are relying on the good sense of the United States? We had better just refer the matter to the United States senate and tell them to act for Canada. We ourselves would like to know in ratifying this treaty what it is going to do for us. The minister says the inclusion of Behring sea will not do any harm. It looks to me as if it would; it looks to me as if it would shut Canadians out should they be disposed to go up there, and make of Behring sea a sort of reserve for Japan.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend may be sure there is no idea of making it a reserve for Japan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that not the effect?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This treaty has been carefully considered by the officers of the fisheries departments of both the United States and Canada. It is the result of their combined investigations and of what they know of the fishery conditions in these various waters, and they thought that Behring sea should be included. We cannot prevent the Japanese from going there; there is no doubt about that, but we want to have a close season in as considerable an area as possible.

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot conceive of any possible reason for including Behring sea if it is the object to preserve the halibut fisheries of the Pacific coast. Furthermore, if a reason does exist, then we are simply abandoning the Behring sea to the Japanese. That is the effect of this legislation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If that is the effect, my hon. friend may be sure that both Canada and the United States will be willing to amend the legislation so as to exclude the Behring sea.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt that is correct, but it is a remarkable plea to make in defence of a treaty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not admit that that would be the effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the minister does not admit it, but this is his argument: I cannot see what good the inclusion of these words is going to do; I cannot see why it should not perhaps do harm, but if it turns out that way we shall be willing to amend the treaty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Those are not exactly my words. The middle part of my right hon. friend's remarks is from his own lips.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is simply a plainer statement of what my hon. friend has just said.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Knowingly in possession of halibut unlawfully caught.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to point out again to the minister a possible effect of this. We have not developed on the Pacific coast the

trawler system of fishing to any considerable extent for reasons that may perhaps disappear as time goes on and the country expands. If trawler fishing in the Behring sea is developed; if good fishing grounds are discovered there, Canadian and American vessels catching halibut in their trawls would be forced to comply with this act; the halibut would have to be turned in and sold, and so forth. But the Japanese, fishing right alongside, would have the full privilege of fishing with trawlers and keeping the fish. Within the past five or ten years the Japanese have developed a salmon fishery in the Behring sea which is rapidly displacing the fishing of the Americans and Canadians on the Pacific coast. I merely cite that to illustrate that fishing in that district is in its infancy and that its development under the conditions that I have described would result in disaster to us.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend knows that the close season is for three months only, during the winter. I do not think there would be any salmon fishing in the Behring sea in the month of January.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not talking about salmon fishing; I am talking about halibut fishing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend suggested that while engaged in other fishing the Japanese might catch halibut and would be entitled to keep it. But there is no other fishing there during that close season.

Mr. STEVENS: But the Japanese can go in there with trawlers; they can trawl for halibut, and if they discover a halibut bed in the Behring sea they may take the fish and keep them. Does my hon. friend not see the force of that contention? If instead of arguing away from the point the minister would admit that he does not know why the Behring sea is included and that while it is too late to remedy it he would undertake to examine into the matter and if possible get the Americans to exclude the Behring sea, that would be a reasonable answer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That far I can go, surely.

Mr. STEVENS: It is hardly sufficient to answer that it is not likely to happen. I rather expect that not only in the Behring sea but on the Pacific coast the old beds which we are seeking to preserve will within five years be fished quite extensively by the Japanese.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—International Fisheries Commission.

Mr. STEVENS: I have just seen the bill at this moment. I note that there are to be four commissioners, who are to be empowered to make recommendations concerning regulations.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is to carry out the recommendation of the International Commission of 1918.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. LAPOINTE moved the third reading of the bill.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a clause in this bill has just been drawn to my attention which does seem rather remarkable. Section 13 says:

> This act shall come into force on a day to be named by the Governor in Council—

So much for order in council.

> —and may be repealed by the Governor in Council,—

So much more for order in council.

> —provided that it shall not be repealed by the Governor in Council at any time during the existence of the International Fisheries Commission hereinbefore authorized.

Where is this government going to stop? Why not ask parliament for a bill authorizing it to make treaties with any country at any time of any kind and repeal them at any time and on any occasion? It would save a lot of the time of the House. The government asks for power of unconditional repeal; what is parliament for? If parliament deals with the passing of an act, surely parliament should be asked when the act should be repealed. There is no reason for asking parliament's authority to pass if you give the government unconditional authority to repeal. There have been cases where the power of repeal has been reserved to be exercised on the happening of a certain event named by parliament; thus parliament has the whole say. But here there is no event at all; the government decides when to repeal the act that parliament passes. Where is this order in council policy going to stop? I do not know anything else I could suggest to the government to enable it to take everything into its own hands and away from parliament that it has omitted. This is one art the ministers have mastered, and possibly having mastered something they ought to be left to its exercise.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): There is nothing very mysterious about this thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not mysterious; I did not say so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is certainly not mysterious.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is autocratic.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This close season cannot be enforced until the United States congress ratifies the treaty and until the exchange of ratifications takes place. We cannot have this law in force now—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not object to that, but—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Another condition may arise that would give occasion for the putting of the legislation into force. If the United States government, without the ratification of the treaty by the United States senate, passes similar legislation, enacting exactly the same clauses, the Governor in Council may then put this into force, and that cannot be done otherwise than by order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Now, if the right hon. gentleman will permit me—

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister will excuse me, I did not take any exception—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would like to continue if my right hon. friend will allow me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want the minister to misrepresent me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not misrepresented anybody.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He intimated I was objecting to the government having power to call the act into effect. I was not. I objected to the government having power unconditionally to repeal it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was not necessary for my hon. friend to interrupt me to say what he has just said. The difference between what this government is doing now and that famous government by order in council to which he referred is this: Parliament knows what we are going to do. We are asking parliament to give us the power to put this law into force if certain conditions arise. My right hon. friend was legislating by order in council. He was inaugurating policies in this country without parliament ever having been consulted on those policies. That is just the difference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I ask the hon. gentleman now to name one single instance.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh!

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Already the hon. gentleman is becoming the official jeerer for the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, but my right hon. friend is something else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I ask him now to give one single instance in the ten years when the late government did by order in council anything which it was not authorized to do by the parliament of this country.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If it is quite in order I am quite willing to answer my right hon. friend. I can give him one specific instance if he wants it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: During two consecutive sessions of parliament the government of my right hon. friend introduced legislation in the House to appoint a purchasing commission. The bill was fought in parliament and the government had to withdraw it. The following session the same thing happened again, and the bill was withdrawn a second time, and then when every member of the House had gone home after the close of the session an order in council was passed instituting the purchasing commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has come to a specific case as he states. I tell the hon. member that the order in council which was passed was entirely within the power of the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A laugh does not answer. A laugh may be all that is within the power of hon. gentlemen, but it is no answer. Not only so, but the government obtained the opinion of the Justice department.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Read the opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read it! The government obtained the opinion of the Justice department stating that we had the power to pass what we did. We did not pass indeed any order in council establishing a buying commission. We passed an order in council whereby through a commission the government could buy.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I did not say the government had no right to do it. The government had any right under the War Measures Act. They could do anything under that act, and that is what they did in that specific instance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is wrong there. If it had been passed under

the War Measures Act, the War Measures Act was passed by parliament and it was legislation of parliament the same as any other legislation. As a matter of fact, it was not passed on the authority of that act at all. The hon. gentleman should be more careful. It was passed under the authority of powers vested in ministers, under the various acts that give the department power. While I am on my feet the Minister of Justice once, not intentionally I know, made the statement last session that every order in council of the late government which had gone before the courts to determine our authority to pass it had been found ultra vires. Not being certain at the time I afterwards went into the matter with the Justice department and reviewed the whole case, and I found that never in the history of the late government was one single order in council which we passed reversed or declared to be illegal by any court.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Unfortunately I have no right to answer.

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

BUSINESS PROFITS WAR TAX ACT, 1916 AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend subsection three of section 13 of The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and to remove the restriction of the said subsection by which the liability to pay the tax imposed continues for the period of only three years and by which the minister is permitted at any time within three years only to assess such person for the tax, and to provide that the act shall be construed as if the said restriction had never been contained therein.

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

Mr. FIELDING: When the Business Profits War Tax Act was passed it was evidently treated as a measure of a temporary character. There was a clause in it which reads as follows:

Any person liable to pay the tax shall continue to be so liable for the period of three years from the time at which such tax would have been payable.

The business profits tax has ceased to be operative. No new taxes are being levied under the act, but there is a considerable sum of indebtedness to the government arising from past years, and of course we desire to preserve our right to collect these moneys. There may be some doubt arising from the use of that expression "liable for the period of three years", and we are bringing in this resolution to remove any doubt. The effect of it is that the parties shall be liable. It becomes a debt to the government of Canada to be collected at any time the government are able to collect it.

Mr. HANSON: Without any limitation at all?

Mr. FIELDING: As to time, certainly. It is like any other debt.

Mr. HANSON: But unlike any other debt there is no limitation. I do not see why the minister should make it perpetual without any limitation. If the government does not collect say within three years from the date of the assessment, why should the Crown be in any better position than an ordinary creditor?

Mr. FIELDING: Because the Crown is at all times in a better position than a private claimant.

Mr. GOULD: I understand that this will do away with the privilege that obtained in the past of taking notes from certain companies in payment of taxes.

Mr. FIELDING: It does not take away any privilege the government have, but it makes it clear the government have power to collect the debt in any way in which they think they can collect it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister is quite right in bringing down this bill if it is what I assume it is, that is, if it is to remove the limitation of three years and preserve to the Crown its full right of priority to these taxes over all other claims. Something has been said as to the necessity for this and the hardship it may work if collections are allowed to be made for a longer period than in the ordinary case. I would like to say in connection with all these collections that are being delayed, my hon. friend is doing just what I did, refusing to put business out of business. That is why he needs this bill. He has been in power now for eighteen months and more, and the reason that he wants this bill is that he wants Canada to continue to function. He wants to be able to give people time, and it is absolutely necessary to give them time. I think he is doing the right thing. What we did before was to enable people to carry on. They ought not to be allowed to escape payment of the debt on the one hand whenever the debt can be collected, nor on the other hand should the Crown lose its absolute priority. The Crown has absolute priority as to the course to be pursued, and unless

the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) thinks that we should have sold out the three hundred odd farmers in his own province that were carried there is necessity for this kind of provision. I take it that what the minister is doing is simply carrying out the old instructions that were given. Those were that every man that could be made to pay should pay; but that if you could only collect a fraction of your debt by closing industries, shutting up factories, and adding to unemployment, it was not good business for the government to do it. I take it that that is what my hon. friend is doing.

Mr. GOULD: In reference to the statement made by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) that three hundred farmers were not sold out in Saskatchewan I should like to point out that when he was a minister of the Crown he seemed to consider it his duty to impose heavy penalties in the case of these farmers. Instead of granting concessions such as are proposed, a penalty of 7 per cent was imposed upon those farmers who were in arrears, while the company referred to was allowed to give a note for arrears. I did complain of that. That is the difference between the treatment extended to "big business' and that granted to small concerns.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There has been no difference in the procedure at all. Anybody who knows the facts knows that to be true. A whole lot of nonsense was talked and all sorts of allegations were made against the late government. I will ask my hon. friend the minister now if he has had to make any change whatever in the general instructions that were given in connection with these taxes. Further I am going to ask him this: Take for example the Riordon case that has been referred to. Why, pulp now is worth $30 or $40 a ton more than it was when it was thought we should sell out the Riordons. If we had done that we should have cut out the claims of hundreds of farmers in the north country. I am going to ask the minister now if he has sold the Riordons out or if he has in any way changed the instructions that were given?

Mr. CAHILL: I should like to ask if the Riordons have paid off their creditors through the country?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You will have to ask the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot answer the first question. In regard to the question of my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) I think it has been the rule hitherto to refuse to give any information, regarding the government's claim against any particular person for income tax. I regard that as a confidential matter and I propose to adhere to the rule.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the position taken by my hon. friend is absolutely right. I should like to point out though just what is sometimes done by hon. gentlemen. The minister has said, and said properly that this is not a matter to which any publicity should be given. Why, the old government was charged with having brought down legislation which would prevent the giving of particulars in each and every one of these cases.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not my hon. friend think it is often a good policy to give people time to meet the claims against them?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is perfectly right, making sure that no claim is waived. There was no difference in the world made between any of these cases. Anyone who got time had to pay for it, and every man was forced to pay that could be made to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry the Minister of Finance cannot give information as to the Riordon case. However, I do not find fault with him for not giving it. So far as I know I do not think he had any part in the dishonest, virulent, and utterly disgraceful campaign that was carried on in connection with the Riordon note. Nothing was so likely to impose on the ignorant as a campaign of that sort. The Minister of Agriculture laughs in glee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What I was noting, Mr. Chairman, was that when my hon. friend stated the ignorant were imposed on he took a deliberate look towards the Progressives.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had in mind, I admit, a real interrogation point as to why the campaign should have imposed on the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), I did not know until this evening that it really had. I am sorry if my remarks necessarily included him. I knew that it had imposed on the Minister of Agriculture. I know that he stooped to use it. I knew that he filled the pages of his paper in Regina with the most scandalous advertisements deliberately intended to mislead the people of Canada.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have no paper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend does not know of it; he is not responsible for the Leader. In one sense I do not believe he is but he was the parent of this campaign, and the pages of that paper were filled with paid advertisements deliberately intended to deceive the hard-working people on the question, to deceive the honest electors. He did deceive them by the hundreds and he is responsible for the dishonest campaign that was carried on. The Riordons were treated just the same as everybody else, just in the same way as this government has treated them ever since they came into power—precisely the same. Whatever was done was done in the public interest. All that the note given in this case did was to fix the amount so that there could be no future dispute on the part of the Riordons. The note carried interest at the rate of 7 per cent, it was a demand note for which they were liable at any time.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not saying this in the spirit of fault finding but if the Riordons are trying to reorganize their affairs and get on their feet will not this discussion have the effect of preventing them from achieving their purpose?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it will have that effect. I do not think it will affect them very seriously, if I thought it would I would not discuss the matter. I hope they will be able to get on their feet again; I believe an honest attempt is being made to do so.

Mr. FORKE: If this discussion is going to be kept up I hardly see how we are going to prorogue by Saturday.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just as well that the truth should come out in regard to this as in regard to other matters, especially when we find intelligent people like the hon. member for Assiniboia associating himself deliberately with those responsible for the campaign to which I have referred.

Mr. GOULD: I may inform my right hon. friend, and I wish to state most positively that I have never referred publicly to the Riordon incident, and this is the first time I have ever made mention of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad to hear the hon. member say so. I rather thought my allusion of a moment ago did him an injustice. I now know that it did. However, I have said all that is necessary and I think the whole situation is now clear to the House. Sometimes it is hard to describe a shade of difference in colour, but if there was one thing that was blacker and more indelibly disgraceful than all the rest it was the conduct of certain gentlemen opposite with respect to the Riordon matter.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the Minister of Finance give the committee any idea of the probable amount of arrears carried by the government?

Mr. FIELDING: I understand the question is in relation to the amounts unpaid. On account of the business profits, I am advised that about $8,000,000 remains unpaid out of $200,000,000 levied.

Mr. SHAW: I have no objection to the resolution, but, as a matter of information, I would like to know whether the three year restriction was imposed at the outset?

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member will admit that I am not in a position to answer. I think the idea was that the act was of a temporary character; and as a matter of fact it was suspended after a short time, but I cannot say definitely as to the cause. I am only guessing at it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was entirely an act of a temporary character. It was the same here as in England and other places, an emergency matter, and of such a character that it would never do for the permanent kind of revenue—absolutely unfitted for normal times—and it was renewed each year for the three years. Of course, when times were good and the money could be collected there was no trouble; but when deflation came we certainly did not want to throw off all these claims with one hand or to throw people on the street with the other hand; and the extension is necessary for the purpose of keeping the prior lien as against all the property these people had.

Mr. SHAW: Could the ex-Minister of Finance inform me whether or not the act contemplated operation for a period of three years; or whether, as far as the Crown was concerned, it could only recover for that period?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was renewed each year. It was only an act in the first instance for one year, and it was then renewed for another year.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 248 to amend the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.

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

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE INCOME WAR TAX ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Income War Tax Act, 1917, and to provide:

1. That in any case the income of a tax-payer shall be deemed to be not less than the income from his chief occupation, and if he has income from more than one source the minister shall have power to determine which one or more, or which combination thereof shall, for the purpose of the Act, constitute the tax-payer's chief occupation, and the income therefrom shall be taxed accordingly.

2. That such reasonable rate of interest on borrowed capital used in the business to earn the income, as the minister in his discretion may determine, shall be allowed as a deduction, notwithstanding the rate of interest payable by the tax-payer. To the extent that the interest payable by the tax-payer is in excess of the amount allowed by the minister, it shall not be allowed as a deduction.

3. That in computing the amount of the profits or gains to be assessed, a deduction shall not be allowed in respect of the disbursements or expenses not wholly, exclusively and necessarily laid out or expended for the purpose of earning the income, or any outlay, loss or replacement of capital or any depreciation, depletion or obsolescence, except as otherwise provided in the Act.

4. That further provisions be made respecting the exemption of the income of Consuls and Consuls General, and of officials or officers of a foreign country, and respecting the exemption of the income of officials of Great Britain or any of its self-governing colonies and of the pensions of any member of the military, naval or air forces of His Majesty's Allies.

5. That in the case of a return by an employer, the penalty shall be further limited to an amount equal to ten per cent of the aggregate amount of the tax payable by the employees who should be reported on such return, but in any case should the penalty be less than two dollars then in lieu thereof the penalty shall be two dollars.

6. That sections twelve to twenty-one of the said act be repealed and provisions be made regarding notices of appeal, and for an appeal on notice to the Exchequer Court of Canada from the decision of the minister, and further proceedings thereon.

7. That all taxes, interest and penalties payable under the act shall constitute a lien upon the assets of the tax-payer, both real and personal, and this lien shall be deemed to attach or to have attached, on the first day of May, immediately succeeding the taxation year in respect of which the tax was payable, or to which the interest and penalties relate, and shall have priority over any mortgage, conveyance or securities as shall be prescribed.

8. That when the minister has knowledge or suspects that any person is or is about to become indebted to a tax-payer he may demand of such person that the moneys otherwise payable to the tax-payer be in whole or in part paid over to the Receiver General of Canada on account of the tax-payer's liability under this act.

[Mr. Fielding.]

9. That further provisions be made regarding distress in default of payment, and for the recovery of all taxes, interest and penalties in the Exchequer Court of Canada, and for the registration of a certificate of the Commissioner of Taxation as to amounts remaining unpaid, and the enforcement thereof.

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

Mr. FIELDING: I think, as far as these resolutions go, they are likely to have the entire concurrence of the House, and I am inclined to think two or three hon. members would be glad if we would go much further; but I am cherishing the hope that the resolutions will be found satisfactory. The resolutions do not introduce much that is new. In several instances they are really intended to clarify the existing law. Where a party is engaged in several lines of business, questions arise as to the particular branch of business on which the tax should be levied. It is desirable we should make it clear that whatever is determined to be his chief occupation shall be recognized as the basis of taxation; and as doubts have arisen in that respect, it is made clear here that the minister, in the event of a dispute of that character, shall have the right to determine what is his chief ocupation; and the tax shall be levied accordingly. It is, perhaps, debatable whether we have that power now, but this is designed to make it quite clear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister goes a little further. I went through the resolution this afternoon. I think we have had the power always; but the minister is going a little further now. He is providing now that if a man holds two positions, or if he is in two businesses, the minister will have the right to say "both of these are main businesses," and treat them accordingly.

Mr. FIELDING: It is giving the minister the power to determine disputes of that character. That is one purpose of the resolution.

Mr. MARLER: Will this section of the act not permit the minister to distinguish what is class A income and what is class B income also?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, it will give the minister that power.

Mr. MARLER: In other words, the income will be the sum of the earning capacity of the tax-payer, no matter from what source.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MARLER: And also that the tax will be paid on the greatest income the tax-payer has; in other words, if a man's class A income exceeds his class B income, he has to pay on his class A income.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the old law.

Mr. MARLER: Would the minister inform the committee why no deduction is allowed from class A income, providing the deduction is of a character such as allowed on class B income? In other words, I will illustrate it in this way: the class A income of the taxpayer amounts to $5,000, and the class B income to $2,000. There are deductions allowed under the act with respect to the class B income of $2,500; consequently the deductions, taking a hypothetical case, are more than the man's class B income. The overplus of $500 is not allowed as deductions from class A income; hence the tax-payer is not paying on his net income.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He is paying on his net income, but he cannot deduct his collateral losses, that is all.

Mr. MARLER: No, it is not a case of loss at all. It is a question of actual carrying charges. When the income tax came into effect in 1917, people had many obligations; subsequently, under the administration of the act, and quite correctly so, the income was divided into class A or earned income and class B, unearned income, or income which the man derived from investments which the man had put aside. Unfortunately many people incurred various charges such as mortgages on real estate, interest on borrowed money and so forth, and cases have happened where these charges properly incurred are allowed as deductions from class B income. I should like the minister to explain the theory in the act by which a man does not pay on his net income but pays on the whole of class A income even if he has legal and properly deductable charges from class B income.

Mr. FIELDING: There can be no deductions from earned income. Whatever is determined to be the earned income becomes the income of the man's greatest occupation, and from that there can be no deduction.

Mr. MARLER: I hope the minister does not think me impertinent in pressing the point. If so, I will stop immediately.

Mr. FIELDING: I am sure my hon. friend would not be that.

Mr. MARLER: When the tax-payer's legal deductions under class B income are more than the total of that income, why should not the difference be allowed on account of class A? In other words, why should not the tax-payer pay on his net income? This is a very important point, because the tax bears very heavily on the people at the present time, particularly on professional men who have a small amount of savings and who, unfortunately, at times have charges which they acquired in past years and which in many cases are more than the whole of their class B income. They struggle along notwithstanding that, but under the income tax law they are not allowed to deduct anything on account of this. They are charged on the whole of their earnings, and I cannot see the justice of that feature of the act.

Mr. CHURCH: I hope the minister will see his way to amend the law in order that the tax may bear less heavily on those who are least able to pay. The income tax to-day is a great hardship on the man with comparatively small earnings and moderate means. It is not a very desirable form of taxation, for it strikes the smaller man at many points; it begins at his breakfast table and is double-edged. If the man has an income of $4,000 he has to pay his municipal tax on the 1st of May in one instalment, and then the federal authorities come along a few days afterwards and tax him a second time. In other words, the small wage earner is taxed to death. The Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin, when he brought down his budget on the 5th of February, announced a reduction in the income tax in Great Britain because the country was expecting it. The wage earners in Canada are expecting the same thing, because the present system of taxation is not equitable. In my own city I know of a man who was assessed on $50,000. He represented to the municipal authorities that his income was only $25,000, and they accepted his word and marked it down to that figure. A few days afterwards he took out an insurance policy for several hundred thousand dollars on his business. That instance is well known. But there is no difficulty in the tax collector getting after the small man, and he is hit hardest. There should be some co-ordination of the methods of taxation in this country. In the United States the federal, the state and the municipal authorities agree to allow certain fields of taxation to be exploited exclusively by each of these bodies respectively, and the system has worked out satisfactorily. This tax in Canada has been so onerous that charity is being starved. This is a fact so far as Toronto is concerned. When any business man is appealed to on behalf of the hospitals he declares that his subscription is already paid to the Minister of Finance of the country. The whole basis of taxation in Canada is

10 p.m.

wrong. If the war is to be paid for, and nobody suggests that it should not, some method should be found of distributing the burden as equitably as possible so that those who are able will pay more than the less fortunate tax-payers. I hope that next year the minister will provide that incomes up to $4,000, say, shall be exempt from federal taxation. And in the meantime some means ought to be found of co-ordinating the various branches of taxation in this country.

Mr. MARLER: Perhaps the minister would prefer that I should defer any questions I may have to ask until a later stage.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know that I can give any particular reason for the law as it exists. It is the law, and I have not been able to change it. I cannot enter into the reasons that actuated those gentlemen who framed the bill.

Mr. MARLER: The minister has his able assistant with him, but I cannot see where the justice of the law comes in.

Mr. FIELDING: The ruling of the department is based on the law, and I am informed that when the act was first introduced the Minister of Finance of that day so explained its purpose. However, the law will have to be judged as it is drawn, and if there is any doubt about the matter the Minister of Justice will be my adviser. The question arises at times respecting interest on borrowed money. It is claimed that the interest on borrowed money in whatever form it may be is a proper charge against a man's business and should be deducted before his income is declared.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That has always been the case.

Mr. FIELDING: I am informed that it is doubtful whether the law permits that now. We are proposing to make it clear that where interest is paid in any form in business it is a proper charge against the business and should be deducted before the income is declared.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole question was as to whether it was borrowed against the business. There is one point, however, on which I would comment. The minister is to fix the rate of interest. Why is that done? Suppose a man has to float a bond at 6 per cent and the annual rate of interest comes to 4 per cent. Is it intended that the actual expenditure which would be 6 per cent will be discounted and cut to 4 per cent? Surely the department should not interfere with the details of the actual costs of carrying on business.

Mr. HANSON: I may put a case to the minister. In the year 1921 a company which had made capital commitments prior to that time found themselves in the position of being compelled to borrow money on the market at what proved to be the peak price. Bonds at 8 per cent sold to the underwriters, we will say, at 90, 92 or 95. These bonds ran for a period of twenty years, and can only be callable—I am speaking of industrial institutions—after the stated interval, at a premium. Does the minister propose that as the current rate of interest drops from time to time it shall be allowed as against the income and that the business itself will have to absorb the difference? In the supposititious case I have cited the money cost nearly 110 per cent and the bonds were for a period of twenty years. That was a definite charge against the business as a capital expenditure. It seems to me wholly unfair that in a bona fide case of this character the company shall not be allowed to charge the full amount they have to pay. I quite appreciate that the bond discount is another phase of the question, about which I shall have something to say a little later.

Mr. FIELDING: The ordinary, reasonable rate of interest would be allowed. But suppose the bonds were issued at a high rate of interest, and produced a premium, that practically is not the real rate of interest at all. I hope my hon. friend sees the point.

Mr. HANSON: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: If the bonds are issued at, say, 7 per cent, and are sold at a premium, 7 per cent is not the real interest on that transaction. The object here is to give the minister power to fix a reasonable rate of interest, which would be the ordinary current rate. If under exceptional circumstances a high rate is paid, it would be for the minister to say whether he would allow it or not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Supposing the 7 per cent bond is sold at a premium of 110, this gives the man 6 per cent money. This presents no difficulty. The whole $110 goes into the business and he is really paying only 6 per cent, although the face of the bond says 7 per cent. If it is a case of fraud, and the money has not gone into the business, the department could look after that under the present law. I really think my hon. friend has not thought this out.

Mr. FIELDING: It is an extreme case, but just for illustration suppose the man issues

his 10 per cent bond at 120, he is not paying 10 per cent, and he should not be allowed 10 per cent.

Mr. HANSON: He would not get it.

Mr. STEVENS: He is being allowed only 10 per cent on 100, not 10 per cent on 120.

Mr. FIELDING: But if the bond is issued at a premium, then you are paying a less rate of interest in reality than appears on the face of the bond.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Surely what he is allowed is the interest he pays, and this is really only 6 per cent on the money he gets. I have every confidence in the minister's adviser in such a matter as this, but either it has been wrongly stated to us or the principle is wrong. As the minister has it to-day, he can make any allowance he likes. He can allow me on what I owe my bank 5 per cent, whereas I may be paying 8. Usually the man whose credit is lowest pays the high rate. According to this, anyone who is in that position is going to have to pay on an income that he really is not getting. In a word, he is going to be penalized for his own poverty.

Mr. FIELDING: If he issues 10 per cent bonds at 110, and then claims he is paying 10 per cent and asks for a deduction accordingly, that is certainly not the real rate of interest he is paying.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But his income tax return does not show what rate he is paying. Supposing he issued a 10 per cent $1,000 bond and sold it for $1,200, he would pay on the $1,000 bond $100, and he would return in his income tax statement the $100 paid. The 10 per cent does not appear at all. That $100 should be allowed. It works out really to be a little more than 8 per cent interest.

Mr. FIELDING: The bond itself bears 10 per cent as the rate of interest, and he will be tempted to claim 10 per cent, and that is what he would be allowed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He cannot.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not so sure of that. What we are concerned about is that only a reasonable and fair rate of interest ought to be allowed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may be charged more than is fair and reasonable. Hon. gentlemen to my left say that nearly all of their constituents are charged an excessive rate of interest and if they are, and cannot help paying it, it ought to be allowed them. Why should the minister be empowered to say: Here is a farmer paying 9 per cent, but we are going to allow him 6 per cent when he puts in his tax papers.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case cited of a farmer paying the ordinary rate of interest in his district, this would be a reasonable rate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why should the minister have any jurisdiction? A man is not going to pay any higher interest than he can help.

Mr. FIELDING: In the illustration I gave a man may claim he is paying 10 per cent because he pays that on the bond. Of course, that is only an illustration. I do not see any objection so long as the rate of interest to be credited is fair and reasonable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Suppose he sells his 10 per cent bond at a premium of 25 per cent, he would get in cash $125. As against this sum which has gone into the business there is only a charge of $100. His interest payments, although 10 per cent on the face of the bond, are really only 7½ per cent on the actual money that is in the business. It would be just exactly the same, assuming that 7½ per cent was the proper rate, if he issued a 7½ per cent bond and sold it at par. The only room for fraud would be if the man sold his 10 per cent bond at a premium of 25 per cent and put only the $100 in his business, pocketing the $25. Then I would quite agree with my hon. friend, because the man is not paying interest for it. But that is something which could be checked to-day.

Mr. FIELDING: As a matter of fact, he could put that $25 anywhere he likes, but I am advised that according to the law and practice that $25 is not taxable and we do not get the benefit. If he sells at a premium a $1,000 bond bearing interest at 10 per cent he will claim that that is the rate of interest he is paying. Should he in such a case be credited with paying 10 per cent?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Very well, then this law will say he is not.

Mr. STEVENS: Take the illustration advanced by the minister himself of a $100 bond sold at $120 bearing 10 per cent interest. As a matter of fact that means interest at 8 1/3 per cent. If the man puts the $20 premium in his pocket, he must show that as a return in his own personal income.

Mr. FIELDING: I am informed that that is not the custom.

Mr. STEVENS: Then it is a fraud. On the other hand, if he turns it into the busi-

ness, it stands there as part of his capital and ought to be allowed the full interest charged.

Mr. FIELDING: I am told that according to the practice of the department, the $25, or whatever the amount, is not taxable. I repeat the case: A man says, "I am paying interest at 10 per cent," and he asks to be allowed that. Under this law he would be told, "No, that is not fair because you do not really pay 10 per cent, you pay 7 or 8 per cent, and we charge you that rate." What is unfair in that?

Mr. HANSON: Let me put a concrete case to the minister which came under my own personal observation. In 1921 when money was at a peak price and people had to take care of commitments made prior to the depression, they were obliged to go out and borrow in the market at 8 per cent par. Bonds were sold to underwriters at less than par and were put on the market at one point below par so that the money actually netted the investor 8.10 per cent. Three years later money eases away and is worth only 6 per cent, and these same bonds are quoted at that rate. As I understand it, the purpose of the resolution is to give the minister power to allow only the payment at the rate of 6 per cent on that money, although as a matter of fact the borrower is paying over $160,000 a year interest on the $2,000,000 borrowed. This gives the minister power to allow only $120,000. That is not fair; it is not just.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case my hon. friend mentions there would be no difficulty whatever. The man is actually paying 8 per cent or a fraction more; under the circumstances that would be a fair and reasonable rate and would be allowed.

Mr. HANSON: That is not what the resolution says.

Mr. FIELDING: So far as giving the minister power is concerned, I am not anxious to have that power; if it could be exercised by somebody else, I should be happy to agree to that. But I am told that in the experience of the department cases are arising which make this a necessary measure.

Mr. HANSON: I can understand cases arising where a man has deliberately bonded his property by the issue of high interest-bearing bonds and has taken the premium himself without putting it into his business. That, of course, is a form of fraud.

Mr. FIELDING: He has a right to do it.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. HANSON: I do not say he is doing it illegally, but he is certainly doing it with the idea of defeating the act. A case of that kind should be met on its own merits in a different way. Now, money may at a given time be worth five per cent while a man is paying over 8 per cent for a period of say twenty years. If the minister will give me an assurance that the department will in a bona fide case allow the actual amount of interest paid, I shall not have another word to say, but there is no such assurance in the resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case cited by my hon. friend, where a man has paid 8¼ per cent; where that is the rate he is obliged to pay and he is going to pay it for twenty years, he should be allowed that rate. All these cases will have to be judged on their merits. In all laws of this kind somebody must have the responsibility and I do not know how you can do otherwise than leave it to the minister and trust him to exercise the power in a rational manner. As I say, though, if some other method could be devised it would be very agreeable to me.

Mr. STEVENS: Let us say that bonds bearing interest at 6 per cent and extending over a term of five years are sold at 90; that would make the rate of interest 8 per cent. As I understand it, in a case like that the department will not allow the spread of that capital loss as an interest charge over the succeeding five years, though in the ordinary course of business that is exactly what is done. When a firm sells a bond issue at a loss they simply calculate it as an added interest on the bond, and in my opinion that is the way it should be dealt with by the department. But as I understand it, unless the matter is rectified in this legislation, the department simply call that a capital loss and no allowance is made.

Mr. FIELDING: That is true.

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend look upon that as fair treatment?

Mr. FIELDING: That is the law as it has been administered for some time. I am not anxious to invent troubles; I meet those that come. We were advised by the Department of Justice that the discount was a capital loss and should not be allowed.

Mr. STEVENS: Undoubtedly the Justice department would give such a decision, based on the law as it stands, but what I suggest is that we should adjust the law so that what is in common practice recognized as an in-

terest charge shall be so regarded by the law. Then the Justice department would certainly give the opinion that under the amended law the discount would be an interest charge and not a capital loss.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Unless my memory is all wrong, these difficulties have arisen since I had anything to do with the administering of the department.

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was not familiar with that decision of the Justice department; I had thought that everybody was allowed his proper disbursements connected with the carrying on of his business. Certainly bank charges of interest, bank charges on a man's overdraft, on the discounting of his notes and so on, are very proper charges against his business, and I have never heard that challenged. Nor have I ever heard challenged what actually happens when a loan is made. Suppose money is worth 6 per cent and a business concern making a bond issue puts it out, for the purpose of keeping its credit in good shape, at 5 per cent, selling it at a discount. Now, when the investor buys bonds at a discount he regards it as just so much more interest to him, and if he buys it at a premium it is the same thing reversed. Unless firms are permitted to make that discount up in the ordinary added charges the effect is to make one rate of interest for the man who sells up to the market and another rate for the man who sells below the market, and that does not seem to be fair.

Mr. BAXTER: I assume that the department acting on the advice of the Justice department, has been following certain English decisions which may or may not be applicable to our act; at all events they think they are. Under these decisions the interest that has been paid to banks on what might be called current accounts, temporary loans, has been deducted, but interest payable in respect of bond issue has not been permitted to be deducted. These at all events are the English authorities, and I understand that the minister is introducing this legislation for the purpose of allowing a deduction on bond interest on other permanent securities. I am in sympathy with what the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) says, but at the same time I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that all over the country outrageous means are being resorted to for the purpose of evading the income tax. Those of us who are putting in honest statements, rendering an account up to the last cent of our income, are being penalized for our honesty in favour of people who are putting in statements that are not a bit better than a tissue of lies. I want to see something that will protect the honest man whose case was referred to by the hon. member for York-Sunbury but that will give the minister or will give someone the power, if a company makes a sham issue of bonds at an outrageous rate of interest, payable perhaps in New York or elsewhere outside the Dominion, and not taxable, to allow that business only the fair and legitimate amount of interest that ought to be borne by it. So far as this legislation is intended to prevent fraud of that character I am heartily in favour of it, but I would like to see the provision accompanied by some rider to protect the man who had honestly issued bonds at a high rate of interest some years ago from having to submit to a smaller rate of interest merely because the price of money drops for the moment. At the same time I wish to reaffirm my adhesion to the principle that the department or someone should have ample authority to prevent these outrageous frauds that are taking place in almost every direction.

Mr. MILLAR: I would like to ask a question that is very much akin to some already asked, but it affects more particularly the man who borrows direct from the bank. When one borrows from a bank at 8 per cent the bank retains the interest at the time the loan is made. Suppose for instance one borrows $100 at 8 per cent, he will get only $92. The note is renewed every three months and the interest compounded would probably accumulate to almost 9 per cent. We will say 9 per cent for the purpose of illustrating the point. Would the borrower be allowed in connection with his income tax return the interest he has actually paid or just 8 per cent?

Mr. FIELDING: I doubt if you could reduce these various suggestions into writing. You must allow some measure of discretion to someone, and I doubt if any better discretion can be exercised than the minister can bring to bear on the question. Temporary interest has hitherto been allowed. I would think in the case cited by my hon. friend that whatever is the usual and customary rate in that part of the country an intelligent minister would say should be allowed. We must suppose that the minister has some intelligence, and if in one part of the country the interest rate is a high one, if it is the ordinary current rate the minister would allow

it, and if in other parts the interest rate is low, I think the minister ought to be allowed to recognize that as the proper rate. You must give some discretion to the minister whoever he may be. The suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John commends itself very much to me, but I doubt if you could put it into writing to make it effective. I can assure the House that there is no desire on the part of the minister to get any power in this matter, but I do not see how you can conduct a department of this character without having someone with some discretion to determine these matters in dispute. There is a case I shall come to later where I am anxious to be relieved of authority. Far from seeking authority, I am trying to get rid of it.

Mr. STEVENS: In connection with the rate of interest to be added, and having in mind my hon. friend's illustration of a bond selling at 120, the minister takes power to determine what the rate shall be, but in the next clause in connection with discounts, that is of bonds sold at a discount, the minister does not take a similar power. Why should not the principle applicable in the one case be equally proper in the other? Why not take power in this act to determine whether the discount should be allowed as interest and not capital loss?

Mr. FIELDING: This matter has been settled in the practice of the department for some years, and I hesitate to depart from it. The department years ago ruled that the discount was a capital loss which should not be credited. I suppose something can be said on both sides of the question, but that has been the fixed policy of the department and I am reluctant to depart from it. In this matter I am rather disposed to take the doctrine "what we have we'll hold," and what we have not got we will try to get if it is necessary for efficient management.

Mr. STEVENS: Just one comment on the minister's explanation. Does he not see that the tendency is to drive issuing companies to issue at a high rate of interest so as to earn a premium rather than at a lower low rate of interest and sell at a discount? Just let me point out the advantages of a discount, if money happens temporarily to be dear. Very often a firm rather than fixing a high rate of interest on a long term bond would prefer to sell at a normal rate of interest and accept a discount spread over the term of the bond. That is preferable in my estimation in normal business to selling bonds at a high rate of interest and securing the premium. The legislation presented here will have a tendency to force concerns to sell their bonds at a high rate of interest, which is certainly not in the interests of the department or the revenue of the country. I think while my hon. friend is certainly right in not seeking trouble, he must recognize that it is good business practice to sell a bond issue at a discount and absorb the loss in the interest charge from year to year.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: I have no doubt that a law like the Income Tax Act will at all times be open to suggestions of possible changes. I am inclined to think it is desirable that we should have a consolidation of the income tax law, and when we come to deal with that consolidation in a proper way these suggestions may well receive consideration. I would not like to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend in this measure, which only aims to deal with a few points about which there ought not to be much difficulty.

Mr. GOULD: I had a question which I wished to ask the minister more particularly with reference to clause 1. I will cite a concrete case to illustrate my point. I think the business income tax forms are called Form T and the agricultural forms Form TA. At all events that will serve for purposes of illustration. The case which I cite is that of an individual whose activities may be partly business and partly agricultural. In 1921 this individual made out his income tax returns on his two activities as a total but he was advised by one of the zone commissioners of taxation that that was improper, and that he would have to segregate the two. In segregating the two it was obligatory for him to take all his exemptions and place them against his agricultural tax bill, and use the other sum total of his business activities as a basis for taxation, upon which he paid the sum of $28 I believe. I think this year the same man is allowed to take the two activities together. I may say that if in 1921 he had been allowed to do that the sum payable would have been considerably less than $28, but I am not prepared to say exactly what it would be. I have wondered whether the returns sent in covering the year 1921 or the returns covering the year 1922 were correct.

Mr. FIELDING: All I can say about that, if my hon. friend or anybody else is interested in a case and would be kind enough to send us a memorandum we would have it investigated. I would not like to answer offhand here. We get many applications and in most cases we are able to give satisfactory explanations.

Mr. GOULD: When I am around my home many visitors come to ask me to assist them in making out their returns, and I usually abuse the tax form because of its complications. I have in mind a thought suggested by the statement made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) that would be particularly applicable in our rural municipalities in the western country where we keep a clerk upon full salary the year round paid out of municipal funds. Our provincial governments ask for an inventory each year, not for taxation purposes, but simply for the purpose of collecting data as to how much stock, how many horses, cattle, how much agricultural machinery and so forth each individual owns. This goes through the municipal clerk's hands, and I maintain that this inventory would be of assistance to the minister, if the municipal clerk was allowed say a very small percentage of the income tax that would be derived, I think it would be one of the best investments the minister could make. People do not send in wrong returns wilfully as is sometimes charged, but in many cases they are absolutely unable to make the returns out right. I am sure it would be a very good investment for the minister to adopt my suggestion, which I believe I made to the ex-Minister of Finance when he was occupying the position of minister.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it might be to the advantage of the committee if I proceeded to state the object of the several clauses and then perhaps it will not be necessary to go into the matter more in detail. Under the present law a foreign consul who is a citizen of a foreign country residing in Canada and devoting his whole time to diplomatic work is exempt from income tax, but that exemption does not apply to the officials of his staff. We propose that those officials shall also be exempt if they are citizens of a foreign country residing in Canada and devoting themselves entirely to diplomatic work, provided that a similar exemption is extended to Canadian officials in the country from which the foreign consul comes. This is reciprocity as respects not only the consul himself but also his staff.

Mr. HANSON: Before the minister proceeds to section 5 would he give us a statement as to the necessity for section 3? I think he overlooked that.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of that, I am informed, is that the expenses of each year shall be considered in connection with that year, but that each year must stand on its own bottom

Now, in the matter of pension exemptions. We exempt pensions paid by the British or Canadian governments, but we do not exempt pensions paid by foreign governments. There are a number of citizens of Canada who have served in the armies of our allies and who have been allowed pensions. We propose to deal with them as we do those receiving pensions from the British or Canadian governments. The exemption, however, will apply only to those who served in the armies of our alllies during the war. That provision, I imagine, is not likely to be regarded with any objection.

Now in regard to the matter of penalties. I think much of the dissatisfaction with regard to the income tax—and I am aware that all tax laws must create dissatisfaction—results from the penalties which are imposed. The penalties that are imposed are of a substantial character, sometimes for very small offences. For example an employer fails to make a return as to those people in his employ as required by the act, and we impose penalties running up to as high as $50. We propose now to reduce that, and provide that the penalty shall not be less than $2 and shall not be more than $50, but it is to be governed by a percentage so that no more than 10 per cent of the amount of taxation would be paid in any case. The list of persons sent in in that way would be a list of persons paying only small sums, and we say the penalty for neglecting to send a return shall in any case be not more than 10 per cent of the taxation involved, with a further proviso that the penalty shall not be less than $2 or shall not be more than $50. In that way I hope we shall to a large extent meet the complaints that are made. The penalties undoubtedly seem to be severe for a small offence but I am hoping that in that respect there will be less complaint in future.

Now as to appeals. Under the present law provision is made for a board of appeal. I think I am correct in stating that neither in the time of my predecessor nor in my own has any one of these boards of appeal been created. The law is there and some people occasionally ask for an appeal. Experience has shown that by a little patience, correspondence, and negotiation we have generally managed to avoid the appeal and come to a settlement. However, I think there ought to be an appeal but not to the Minister of Finance. We hope, of course, that by continued correspondence, patient inquiry and good will we can avoid courts of appeal and come to a friendly settlement; but if in any case a

cantankerous person is not satisfied with the representations that are made and the judgment of the local officers, he ought to have the right of appeal but he had better not go to the Minister of Finance. We propose that he have the privilege of going to the Exchequer Court. These are the main, in fact the only, provisions of the bill.

Mr. MARLER: I suppose we will have an opportunity of discussing section 7 of the resolution when the bill comes before us?

Mr. FIELDING: The bill will come up in a moment or two and I would rather my hon. friend spoke now.

Mr. MARLER: I should like to see that section in the bill.

Mr. FIELDING: Have you not a copy of the bill?

Mr. MARLER: I have a copy of the bill here but it has not been introduced, therefore I avoided speaking on it. What I wish to point out to the minister is that section 25 of the bill carries out the intent of section 7 of the resolution creating a prior lien on all the assets, movable and immovable, of the taxpayer. Under the law as it exists at the present time there is a lien I know in favour of the government for any income tax owing. I think it may possibly be a prior lien but it is not a prior secured lien at the present time. Under the bill as drafted a prior lien will be created on all the assets of the individual. There is a proviso in this section that an individual may alienate personal property, but there is no provision that he may alienate his immovable property. In addition to this the minister might, perhaps, bear in mind that income tax is payable by instalments if need be. It would mean, I take it under this section of this bill that anybody intending to borrow, anybody desirous of effecting a mortgage on a piece of real estate, would first of all have to show the person from whom he was borrowing his receipt in full for his income tax before that person would lend him any money. If the tax-payer had paid his income tax in toto for the year there would be no difficulty; but if the taxpayer was paying it by instalments I question very much, in the event of his wanting to borrow, whether he would not be very seriously jeopardized by the provision of the clause as it is now drafted. I certainly would think that if he were mortgaging his property he would be. I suggest very respectfully to the minister that the clause as drafted is likely to create difficulty.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: There is a lien now, I believe but the effect of this is that the tax falls due, say, on 30th April, and the priority of lien takes effect from that moment. I shall have to give further thought to the suggestion of my hon. friend arising out of the payment of instalments. Of course we want the prior lien to be maintained and broadened if we can. We want to get our money; I am becoming a very mercenary person in all these matters.

Mr. MARLER: I am quite aware there is a lien at the present time, and I think there is a prior lien. But this section of the bill as now drafted makes that lien an actual secured lien which is quite a different thing from an ordinary prior lien, and that is what I take exception to. Of course, if it is understood that way by the government, and the government does not think as I do that it would be a very serious matter for the borrowing public, I have nothing more to say. However, I think the point should be brought to the attention of the government. I might also say to the minister that this section will bear some discussion when the bill is brought down.

Mr. MILLAR: I have just one question I should like to ask and it is one in which many hundreds are interested. A short time ago I passed on to the minister a suggestion sent by a business man in the constituency from which I come. He was trying to find out if there was not some way to avoid the unnecessary trouble and expense to which many thousands are put to make out statements when they themselves know, and local authorities know, that their receipts only amount to a very small fraction of a taxable income. I know it is a difficult matter to adjust, but I can assure the minister if he can devise some way of saving that expense to those people he will confer a very great benefit upon them. It makes it necessary for most of them to go to a lawyer and have a statement made out, at an expense of from $2 to $5, and to a man who has lost his crop, or perhaps has had a very poor crop, that expense is quite an item.

Mr. FIELDING: I have difficulty in understanding how he can obtain the knowledge without the return. I do not mind confessing that, when I was on the other side of the House and talked about this question, I expressed the pious hope that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) would be able to do something to simplify this matter. The returns were very annoying.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Much worse than that.

Mr. FIELDING: I am free to confess that having had the responsibility on my own shoulders, I see great difficulty in attempting to simplify. What seemed to me an easy job is a very hard one. I do not see how you can gather the information, unless you require the return.

Mr. MILLAR: The suggestion I passed to the minister from the business men was that a statement from the clerk of the municipality—and I think I might add also, on my own behalf, a statement from the banker —should surely be sufficient.

Mr. FIELDING: We want uniformity of practice. We cannot oblige the municipal clerk or the banker to make the return. I wish I could make it simpler. I know it is a worry. When I have to make up my own return I get very "mad."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister will remember when we were discussing the act last year I drew to his attention that I, during the latter term of my office, had heard that companies were being incorporated for the purpose of enabling them to avoid taxes. I was surprised the other day to have a gentleman dealing in rather a large way, come to me—he thought I was in business—with a view of getting an incorporation of a private holding company which would enable him to defeat the purposes of the income tax. I drew the matter to my hon. friend's attention last year, and he said he would look into it and follow it up. I have been told since that it has become a common practice. My hon. friend will very easily find lots of people within a very short distance who would do it. I would like to know the minister's idea.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid there is too much foundation for what the hon. member has mentioned. We are giving the matter some attention, and if we are fortunate enough to be able to complete before next session the consolidation which I referred to, I think we will have to deal with the matter very seriously. For the moment we are not able to deal with it. I regret to say that reports have reached me that there is too much foundation for what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. HANSON: I am glad to see the minister has arrived at that conclusion. He will find that reports that have reached him have not been exaggerated.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would require only a very short section of the act. Could protection not be put in now?

Mr. FIELDING: It is a difficult matter to deal with.

Mr. EVANS: I desire to bring to the attention of the minister a case which seems to me to be one of gross unfairness, where a tax is not levied on a man's net income. An acquaintance of mine, a farmer, met with crop failure for two seasons. Being a veterinary surgeon, he went out to make his living at his former profession. He made a little money, and had to pay income tax on it. His money all went to clear his debt on his location; and at the end of the year there was nothing left even to pay the income tax. It was a gross hardship to pay any tax.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the new section will cover the case. Where a man is engaged in two occupations difficulties arise, but under this section power will be vested in the minister to determine what is his chief occupation and on that he must pay.

Mr. EVANS: But that is a tax on a man's net income.

Mr. FIELDING: No, that is too broad a statement. He might make $20,000 in a year. which is subject to taxation; he might go out and speculate, lose it all, and have no income, and he would have no tax to pay. That is an extravagant illustration, but it is based on what has occurred. That which is his greatest income should be taxed. We cannot prevent a man speculating, but we do not want the income tax to suffer on that account.

Mr. NEILL: Does the minister think it is necessary to adopt paragraph No. 8 of the resolution, which says:

> 8. That when the minister has knowledge or suspects that any person is or is about to become indebted to a tax-payer he may demand of such person that the moneys otherwise payable to the tax-payer be in whole or in part paid over to the Receiver General of Canada on account of the tax-payer's liability under this act.

We already find the minister under paragraph 7 stating that all taxes, interest and penalty payable under the act shall constitute a lien upon the assets of the taxpayers both real and personal, a condition that does not exist in reference to municipal or provincial taxation. But has he a right to go out on a roving hunting commission, whenever or wherever he suspects a man to have any dealings with the taxpayer, and register a letter and send it to that man, and say "Do not pay that man what you owe him; pay it all to me?" I do not think, with all the other means they have of collecting, it is necessary to give the minister such extreme powers as those.

Is there any precedent in any other country where a man can make use of a mere suspicion and go out and take action of that kind? I object to the word "suspect." If he only has a mere suspicion, he can hold up this man and prevent the payment of money to him that would perhaps really be of substantial benefit to him at the moment. Meanwhile, while the consideration of the adjustment of his taxation goes on, which might last for two or three months, the money is withheld from him and he cannot make use of it.

Mr. FIELDING: I am told there is a precedent in the United States law, but that is not the best reason in the world. However, I am advised in the light of experience that something of this kind is necessary. All sorts of attempts are made to evade taxation, and we must have privileges in the method of guarding the revenue which in view of some people are not necessary. We ought to have the benefit of the doubt in the matter of saving the revenue. We all have a common interest in that.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister think the ordinary garnishee process is not sufficient? I rather think this is an extraordinarily wide power, and if arbitrarily operated it might work a very great injustice. I hate to see a power like this placed in the hands of the tax collector of any government, I do not care what the personnel might be.

Mr. FIELDING: Least of all, I do not think hon. members need fear that any power we have will be exercised in an arbitrary spirit. The manner in which the income tax has been applied by my predecessor and in my own day would indicate that there was no desire to use the power arbitrarily. I think every desire is manifested to make it as easy as possible. A few cases will arise under this provision, and if they arise, I think hon. members will not object to our exercising the power given to us.

Resolution reported.

On the motion for the second reading of the resolution:

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I wish to say—

Mr. SPEAKER: Under rule 17 A this motion is not debatable. Later on the hon. member will have an opportunity to speak.

Motion agreed to and resolution read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 249 to amend The Income War Tax Act, 1917.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. FIELDING moved the second reading of the bill.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): I must confess that I was keenly disappointed on reading this bill. I was disappointed at the fact that there was no provision, in the matter of earned and unearned income, no provision regarding exemption on account of children, and no provision with reference to persons married under the regime of community of property. No one realizes more than I do the tremendous task of the Minister of Finance; no one appreciates to a greater extent than I do his earnestness, his ability and knows the many demands that are made upon him. But surely when these demands are reasonable, when they are in the public interest, the minister should yield to some of them, to some extent at least. In this special instance I venture to say, from the discussion which arose on this question when it was brought up on a previous occasion, that it was the wish of this parliament that some amendment should be introduced regarding the proposal which was put before the House. When I submitted my resolution on March 21st touching these matters, it was passed unanimously; there was not one dissenting voice raised against it. On the 17th of May, when I renewed my proposal, I think it was evident that I had the sympathy of the whole House in the matter. There was not a single word of opposition. I am fully aware that in order to meet our obligations we must get as much revenue as we can. But I submit that we should get that revenue from the people who are most able to pay. I will not weary the House with the arguments that I have already advanced. I am sure that the minister is himself convinced of the soundness of my proposals, and he must have had very good reasons for not bringing in the amendments suggested. It is not asking too much, I hope, to request an explanation from the minister of the reasons why he did not incorporate these amendments into the bill. I feel confident that were I to submit an amendment to the House it would carry. But I will refrain from doing so until the Minister of Finance explains why these amendments were not included in the bill. I do not say that when the bill is before the committee I will not propose them. However, I shall listen to the reasons the minister may offer and I hope that before the bill reaches that stage he will give to the House some satisfactory reasons for not bringing forward the amendments and at the same time assure us that in the near future legislation will be enacted to provide

for the readjustment of income taxation more in line with justice and equity.

Mr. FIELDING: I wish I were as free as my hon. friend to advocate all these popular notions, because they are popular, I am sure. But I regret to say that I am not, because I must have regard to the condition of the revenue. The hon. gentleman brought forward his motion last year and we took it into consideration. More than that, we made some concession. That, I think, should be evidence that I am not so absolutely unyielding as he pictures me. As to a larger review of the Income Tax Act, if it is necessary, I hope that my hon. friend will have patience enough to wait for that consolidation which, without giving any guarantee, I trust will be undertaken in time for next session. I am sorry that I cannot give any reasons that will be satisfactory to my hon. friend because I know how zealous and enthusiastic he is in the matter. But we cannot have everything we want in this wicked world; we must wait patiently for some of the things we much desire.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): As I understand from the minister that next year there is likely to be a consolidation of the act I will in no way suggest to him any amendments I might have to submit to the bill he is now bringing down. On the other hand it is more than probable that no opportunity will be afforded myself or any other hon. member to study the proposed consolidation before it is brought down next year. It will therefore be as well for me now to suggest to the minister certain matters which I should like him to take into consideration when he does undertake the consolidation he has announced.

The first point I want him to consider in that consolidation is the question to which I referred previously this evening, as to the payment on net income of the taxpayer. Where the taxpayer has legal deductions under class B income, if those deductions exceed the total of his class B income, then I think he should be permitted to have a deduction for the surplus made from class A income. In short, the taxpayer should pay on his net income. There is another point which I would draw to the attention of the minister and that is in regard to the manner in which the tax is computed at present. There is the normal tax, there is the surtax, and there is the interest on the surtax or the supertax. This is not only exceedingly onerous on those who are unfortunate enough to have to pay income tax, but it makes it very difficult indeed to compute the tax. Another question that comes to my mind, and which possibly may not be very popular in this House or to the minister but which I would venture to suggest nevertheless, even at this time of the session. I believe that the income tax to-day is far too heavy. That tax under the act as it stands at present is not helping to stimulate savings; it is not stimulating business. I believe that the taxpayers, having to pay as they do pay to-day very heavy taxes, are utterly unable to invest any money in industrial concerns, and for that reason the progress of the country is seriously impeded. In the United States, if I might refer to that republic for a moment, a deduction is allowed, or a lesser tax is levied on account of the savings of a particular taxpayer. If a taxpayer can show a bona fide saving in any year, he is allowed a lesser rate of taxation on the amount actually saved. This encourages economy, which is very essential in this country and I think it is a very important question that should receive careful consideration when the minister comes to take up the consolidation that he has mentioned. Certain deductions are allowed under the present income tax law. Under the act as passed in 1917—this was during the war of course—deductions were allowed for contributions made to the Red Cross and patriotic funds. I am aware, as I think are other members also, that representations have been made to the minister to allow deductions for contributions to bona fide charitable or educational institutions. The deductions allowed under the 1917 act for contributions to the Red Cross and patriotic funds were subsequently withdrawn. The work which those funds carry on is far from finished, and there are numerous charities badly in need of funds not only in the city of Montreal but all over the country. These charities are having greater difficulty year by year in securing funds for carrying on their work, which, in part at least, is really the duty of the state. I ask that contributions made to bona fide charitable and educational institutions be allowed as deductions, or that they be taken into consideration when the new act is framed.

11 p.m.

It is quite true that the minister will immediately say: Well, all these demands must mean a diminution in the revenue. I quite admit that, but still as regards charitable and educational institutions I do not think the state can claim for one moment that deductions allowed for contributions to them will

not eventually enure ten times more to the benefit of the state. Again I quote the income tax law of the United States, under which individual tax-payers—not corporations—are allowed deductions up to 15 per cent of their taxable income, provided that these deductions are paid to a charitable or educational institution approved of in the proper way. There is no question that in allowing deductions of this description and allowing also a taxpayer to pay on his net income alone—which do seem to me perfectly fair and reasonable requests to make—there will be a certain reduction in the amount which will be collected under the income tax law. On the other hand, possibly it is pertinent to suggest that the income tax law was originally framed for the purpose of paying our war debt. Whether the amount derived from income tax can ever be segregated for this purpose I cannot presume to say, but I think I may go this far, that the time does seem to have arrived when the people are strained to the uttermost in their efforts to pay taxes. I am perfectly aware that without these taxes the budget cannot be made to balance as we are budgetting at the present time. The only suggestion I venture to make in these last days of the session is that we should really live within our income, and that our budgets should, if possible, be made to balance with the taxes that are collected. It is quite true that my suggestions would mean a certain decrease in the net revenue collected from income tax, but at the same time it would be an encouragement to people to be charitable and economical.

It seems to me that with our budget deficits year by year we must come to the point sooner or later, and the sooner the better, when we should live strictly within our income.

Mr. FIELDING: How?

Mr. MARLER: By spending less, by actually cutting out many, many things we now spend money on. Perhaps this is the most unpopular thing for any member to say in the dying days of the session, and I suppose everyone will criticize me.

An hon. MEMBER: Not at all.

Mr. MARLER: But let our expenditure be pared down ruthlessly. We should reduce our expenditure to the very minimum and restrict it to keeping our buildings and our public works in repair, in order that we may make our budgets balance without having to increase taxation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been greatly cheered to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman. We have heard speeches along exactly the same lines from this side of the House. We have deplored the increases both of taxation and of expenditure. We now find all our work has not been in vain, and we look forward to the early date when my hon. friend will cross over here—not to take a place down in the corner, but to take his seat among us and really do something to try to cut down expenditure. We are assured that so far as he is concerned none of these extra supplements were brought down until the thirteenth hour passed.

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

On section 1—Income to be not less than income from chief occupation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Observing as I do that we are now almost through with the second budget of this government, and that it has left the income tax schedules in the same condition as it found them, and remembering also the aspirations—to use the most euphemistic term I can think of—of hon. gentlemen opposite and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself, may I inquire if after eighteen months he has not been able to invade the precincts of the profiteer and ease the burden on the masses? And does he hope by remodelling and changing the schedules at some later and undefined time to achieve this end? How is it we have had to wait eighteen months to get the burden on the masses eased and the profiteer brought to book? Is the progress of the future to be as slow as the progress of the past? Is there really any room left for hope?

Mr. FIELDING: I have not heard any allegations that anybody is engaged in profiteering. I had understood that the profiteering was usually carried on during the regime of my right hon. friend. Eighteen months, you know, is a short period in the life of a nation. We are not going to accomplish immediately all that he mentions, but I hope that as years roll on, with patience and courtesy and good will all round, some of these results will be brought about in the natural order of things. I suggest that my right hon. friends be patient and that they rather bear those ills they have than fly to others that they know not of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite realize the solemn truth and wisdom of the Finance Minister's assertion that anything we may hope for will come in the natural order; it certainly will not come in the government order, we may be quite certain of that. Then, he advises the

country to bear the ills they have rather than fly to others they know not of. Well, the country is already impressed with the necessity for that.

Mr. FIELDING: I gave the advice to my hon. friends, not to the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I also am, as the whole country is, thoroughly imbued with that truth, and I think the people are very regretful—the evidences of it are not a few—that they had not been imbued with it and acted upon it sooner. Yes, I admit that times were better in our day; profits were greater on the part of all classes of the country—I am compelled to admit it. We, however, enacted certain legislation to take for the nation a share of those profits, and we were assailed because we did not take more from the profiteer and less from the masses. Now I wonder how it is that in this session we are amending the very bill that apportions as between the profiteer and the masses, and still the Finance Minister can scarcely dot an i or cross a t.

Section agreed to.

On section 7, subsection 15—Notice of dissatisfaction respecting the decision of the minister.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That seems unfair and improper. If a man has a case that the minister himself thinks ought to be considered by the court, I do not know why as a preliminary to his going to the court he must put up security for costs.

Mr. FIELDING: The suggestion came from a very well informed source that that is a wise precaution. It has been well considered and I am confident that it will serve a good purpose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see it is entirely satisfactory to the minister; I hope he will assure us that no litigant who has the right under the act to go to the court will be denied that right.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend can be assured that the good spirit in which this act has always been administered will be continued.

Subsection 15 of section 7 agreed to.

On section 10—Taxes to be a lien.

Mr. MARLER: That is the section to which I had reference a moment ago. It creates on the property movable and immovable of every taxpayer a prior lien ranking before any other obligation of any description. In addition to that, the section as drafted is retroactive from the first of January, 1923. It means that any creditor lending to a debtor on any security, whether it is personal property or real property, will first have to satisfy himself whether or not the taxpayer's income tax has been fully paid I can say positively that no person would lend on mortgage in the province of Quebec without first satisfying himself that the income tax had been totally paid under this section. Moreover, the section allows the transfer of personal property to a bona fide purchaser but it allows no transfer of immovable property. The section is an exceedingly dangerous one. I do not complain in the least degree of the power it puts in the hands of the government, but I do complain of the difficulties it will put in the way of very many borrowers. The government should content itself with a prior unsecured lien, not with a prior secured lien on the property of the taxpayer.

Mr. FIELDING: As my hon. friend states it, we want a secured lien if we can get it. I realize there is something in what my hon. friend says, but I wish he would not press his suggestion now. It will be a short time, after all, before this matter can be reviewed again, and if experience shows that the trouble my hon. friend suggests has arisen we can deal with it in the consolidation. I am hoping the trouble will not be as serious as he suggests.

Mr. MARLER: There is not the slightest shadow of a doubt that the trouble will actually be there when this legislation goes into effect. I am not pressing anything on the minister; I am only explaining the exact effect this legislation will have on the borrowing public, particularly as affecting mortgages in the province of Quebec. If the minister wishes to press the section, of course I will do nothing else but agree to it, but I suggest the insertion after the word "personal" in line 19, of the words "and real"—in other words, differentiating between personal and immovable property.

Mr. FIELDING: Would my hon. friend read the clause as he suggests it be amended?

Mr. MARLER: The proviso reads:

> Provided always, however, that the lien or charge hereby created shall not follow or attach to personal property.

I suggest inserting here the words "or real" before "property."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would discharge the lien entirely.

Mr. MARLER: No. The effect would be that the purchaser would not have to follow whether or not the income tax had been paid. Without this proviso you could not purchase a stock or a bond or a piece of real estate without first inquiring whether this lien, which is an actual mortgage on the man's property, has been fully paid.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is simply a case of another search of taxes.

Mr. MARLER: Yes, but this tax may extend over a term of months. Are we going to insist on the taxpayer paying his whole tax at once before he can sell his stock, before he can sell a bond or a piece of real estate? It is unreasonable.

Mr. FIELDING: If it has the effect of inducing the taxpayer to pay up, that at least is one of the virtues. I hope my hon. friend will find that the evil is not so serious as he suggests. When we come to the consolidation possibly we may be able to meet his views.

Mr. MARLER: Might I suggest to the minister an amendment, to add after the word "personal" in the nineteenth line "or immovable." That does not affect the intention of the section in the very least because it intends to allow a bona fide seller to sell to a bona fide purchaser his personal property. I only want to make it clear that a bona fide seller may sell to a like purchaser his immovable property.

Mr. FIELDING: I hope my hon. friend will not press it.

Mr. MARLER: I dislike pressing my hon. friend, but what reason is there why it should not be included? I think I am entitled to at least get an answer.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will press I will delay the third reading and give the matter consideration but at this stage I think we might accept the section as it is.

Mr. BAXTER: I would like to ask whether the opinion of the Department of Justice has been taken as to the power of this parliament to enact section 7.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the Department of Justice has so advised.

Mr. BAXTER: With all respect I would like to differ from the department, and I do not think anyone would have much to fear about that. While parliament has the power to enforce, that must be within reasonable limits, and to say merely because it is a Crown debt it thereby operates as a lien on real and personal property goes far beyond any express or implied power of the Dominion parliament. A Crown debt takes priority and always will take priority in the administration of assets over other creditors, but that this parliament can legislate so as to constitute a debt due the federal Crown a mortgage upon any particular piece of property in the province I shall always doubt until it is resolved by some authority even higher than the Department of Justice.

Mr. MARLER: I think this section purports to create such a mortgage.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Collection of tax from third party.

Mr. FORKE: Will the minister give us an explanation of this? It seems a rather unusual section. It says, "When the minister has knowledge or suspects that any person" and so forth.

Mr. FIELDING: I am told that this arises from actual events coming under the observation of the department. This is really necessary to prevent evasions of the law. The cases arising would not be numerous, but I think it will be a preventive measure in a large degree. There is a tendency in many lines for people to evade this income tax law. It is almost as open to evasion as the customs law when crossing the border, but all these changes are the result of experience in the department, I am assured. The cases are not likely to occur very often, but they will occur occasionally and I think the existence of a clause like this will help to prevent fraud.

Section agreed to.

On section 28—Certificate of default to be registered as judgment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister done anything towards preventing what is really the grossest system of evasion possible? That is to say, the formation of what are really personal companies to which are assigned the assets of an individual and out of which the individual draws an amount that is really not his income at all but merely the sum he lives on, allowing the rest to accumulate and thereby escape all the income tax except the corporation tax alone. I wonder if the minister has done anything to meet that situation which has arisen practically wholly in his own time.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman who sits behind my hon. friend raised that question in his absence and we had a little discussion

on it. I cannot say that anything particular has been done. I realize that there is too much ground for the view that the law is being evaded. The matter is engaging our attention, and if the consolidation is brought about which we hope, it ought to be included. At the moment we are not sufficiently well advised to deal with it. I quite realize that there is something along the lines suggested by the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is far more important than consolidation. It is a matter of millions upon millions. Other countries have met it, and why has this government spent eighteen months during which this evasion has been rampant and taken no step even to copy the legislation of other countries? It is a gross indictment of the administration, I may impress upon the minister.

Mr. MARLER: Does my hon. friend mean to suggest that these so-called companies have been incorporated since the present administration came into office?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Practically all.

Mr. MARLER: Surely my hon. friend is not serious when he suggests that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There may have been some incorporations taken place before. The income tax has not been in force for so many years, but the effect in the way of evading the tax has been since that time.

Mr. MARLER: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member knew before I wonder he has not impressed it on the government and tried to get some remedy before this. He apparently knew before 1921. Why has he not brought that to the attention of the minister?

Mr. MARLER: How does my right hon. friend know I have not impressed it on the government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he has, it has been rather an ineffective pressure. If the hon. member for the St. Lawrence-St. George division of Montreal (Mr. Marler) has no more effect on the government than to keep on pressing eighteen months and get nothing, it seems to me that it might be a good suggestion for him to go back to his constituents. He comes from a portion of Canada from which he ought to be able to speak with authority. Surely he can produce something more than pious aspirations from the lips of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MARLER: That is precisely the reason I spoke the way I did to my hon. friend, because I thought I did speak with some authority. This act has been in force since the 20th of September, 1917. My hon. friend comes forward to-night and charges that most of these companies have been brought into effect since this government came into power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The evasions have.

Mr. MARLER: My hon. friend has been so very kind in his remarks to me that perhaps he will allow me to continue. Companies were brought into existence during the administration of my right hon. friend. Did he take any action?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has asked a question? Now perhaps he will permit me to answer. He must remember that the income tax refers to the year previous and previous to a certain date in that year, and as a consequence the incorporation of the company would require to be about the year 1918 or 1919 to have any effect at all so far as our income tax collection was concerned. I never heard of such an incorporation myself within those years I want to tell my hon. friend, until virtually before we went out of office.

Mr. MARLER: I am prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's word but not his assertion that this government has not done as much as his government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They had reason to do a whole lot more because the effect of the evasions has been since we went out of office. The hon. member knows that. The loss to the revenue has been in the last two years. The effect certainly has been recently even of incorporations in 1918, which would be the first year they were incorporated.

Mr. MARLER: I am sorry to differ.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course it has been. Does he mean to say it has not been in these last two years?

Mr. MARLER: It has not been wholly in these two years. That is the assertion I made at the commencement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At all events it has been very nearly wholly, and you cannot get things cured just in a minute. The last time we were in office was in the year 1920-21, and I do not think that evasion had effect up to that time. It has only had effect since then

Mr. MARLER: Nothing but righteousness happened up to that time!

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mostly so, or punished crime. But now we find, it seems to me

in the words of John Hay, "Nothing but unpitied suffering and unpunished crime."

Section agreed to.

On section 11—Act to come into force.

Mr. MARLER: May I make another plea to the Minister of Finance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARLER: To suggest that section 25 of the act shall not go into effect until the commencement of the 1924 period of taxation. There is to be a consolidation of the act next year. I am only asking that this particular section 25 be delayed for a year. Six months of the year have already elapsed.

Mr. FIELDING: Will my hon. friend state his request again?

Mr. MARLER: I ask that instead of section 25 coming into effect at the commencement of the 1923 tax period as provided for in subsection 4 of section 11, it come into effect at the commencement of the 1924 taxation period. In other words that the operation of this section be delayed until the first of January, 1924, instead of making it retroactive on the first of January, 1923.

Mr. FIELDING: I will assent to the suggested amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

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

Resolved—1. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may from time to time, advance and pay to the Corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called the corporation, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $10,000,000, as are required to enable the corporation to carry on the construction of terminal facilities in the harbour of Montreal for which plans, specifications and estimates have already been approved by the Governor in Council, and to construct such further terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the said port; in addition to the moneys heretofore authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by any act.

2. That no advance shall be made in respect to the construction of terminal facilities unless such detailed plans, specifications and estimates for the works to be performed by the corporation, on which the money so to be paid is to be expended, as are satisfactory to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have been submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council before any work on same is commenced.

3. That the corporation shall submit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for approval monthly applications for such advances as they may be entitled to apply for, with statements, in detail, in such form as the minister may direct, and upon approval of the same, authority for the payment of the amount applied for may be granted by the Governor in Council.

4. That the corporation shall, upon any advances being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half-yearly at the rate of five per centum per annum.

5. That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any act founded on these resolutions shall be payable by the corporation out of all its property and assets, and out of all its tolls, rates, dues, penalties and other sources of revenue and income whatsoever, and shall rank as a charge thereon, and have precedence in regard to payment next after the payments provided for in section eight of chapter ten of the statutes of 1896 (First session).

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

On section 4—Security for advances.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: May I ask the minister if the harbour commissioners are regularly paying the interest charges on the loans that have so far been made to them?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, every cent of interest has been paid. Last year they paid in interest the sum of $1,138,062.12. They also paid the amount necessary for a sinking fund, and had a surplus of over $200,000.

Section agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 250, to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. LAPOINTE moved the second reading of the bill.

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

On section 2—an additional $10,000,000 may be advanced to the corporation for the construction of terminal facilities.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This bill has not been distributed. Is it in the usual form?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is exactly in the form of the preceding bill—word for word.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 83, respecting banks and banking.

Mr. SHAW: What is the nature of the amendments made to this bill by the Senate?

Mr. FIELDING: I think most of the amendments are of an unimportant character. One of the amendments relates to the question of insurance. There was much discussion in the Banking and Commerce committee, and a clause was put in the act preventing any bank agent from acting as representative of an insurance company. That is the substance of it. An amendment has been made which is designed to meet the case of the Weyburn bank. It was represented in the Senate that the agent of that bank received a considerable portion of his income from the handling of hail insurance, and if that were taken from him, it would practically destroy his income. I have no personal knowledge of this, but I understand that representations made to the Senate led them to adopt words which would practically have the effect I have stated, although they did not mention the name of that bank. The amendment proposed by the senate reads:

After subclause 3 of clause 76 insert the following as subclause 4:

"4. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the agent or manager of a bank, with chief office and branches in one province only, from acting as agent for the placing of hail insurance."

There is no mention made of the Weyburn bank, but I understand it is to meet that particular case. There is one amendment regarding the issue of stock not below par. That is technical, and there is no objection to it.

On page 45 of the bill, section 88, a clause was inserted by the Banking and Commerce committee protecting the unpaid vendor in certain cases. That clause has been stricken out by the Senate.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not concur in that amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: In section 91 the language in the clause relating to discount says:

The rate of interest or discount charged by the bank shall appear on the face of the note.

These words were struck out by the Senate. I think these are the most material alterations. The rest are purely technical as far as I remember.

Mr. ARTHURS: I desire to protest against the elimination of the protection for the unpaid vendor under section 88. I have no desire to delay the House at all. I think it is important that that clause should remain.

Mr. SHAW: I have no objection to the amendment regarding insurance, nor yet have I any material objection to the amendment to section 88; but I have a serious objection to the amendment proposed to section 91. I think the rate of interest or discount should appear in every case on the face of the note. I understood, while in the committee, that the bankers themselves had no objection to this provision, and I cannot understand what interest would be in any way jeopardized by having the rate of interest appear as the Banking and Commerce committee desired. I would, therefore, oppose the Senate amendment to section 91.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I was absent from the committee upon the occasion of the adoption of this amendment. I really never was able to see that it was of any particular value. For instance, I do not know that it does one man any good to know what rate of interest or discount a bank allows another man. Objection was made to the Senate by manufacturers or wholesale dealers who are accustomed to pass drafts upon their customers, and it was stated that frequently these wholesale men, for very good reasons, have a better rate of discount than the customer upon whom they might be passing the draft, and whom, in many cases, the wholesale men practically finance. If it were made apparent from the promissory note or the bill of exchange that the wholesale man was getting, say, a discount rate of 5½ per cent, and he was charging his customer 6½ or 7 per cent, it was stated that that was knowledge which should not be conveyed to the customer.

Mr. FORKE: Why?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why should it? Why should the dealings between one man and the bank be disclosed to another party? I do not think there is any serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. SHAW: In order to meet the situation my hon. friend suggests, why not exclude drafts from the operation of the section? The section, as I understand it, was designed as a deterrent to banks in charging an excess rate of interest.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): You cannot differentiate between a draft and a promissory note. If the objection is valid against one it is against the other. But I have never been able to see what purpose was served by having the rate of interest or the discount appear on the note. There might have been reasons given but unfortunately I was not present when the committee dealt with this clause.

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

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT 1914 AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of bill No. 241 to amend the Dairy Industry Act 1914.

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

On section 1—Definition.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is a slight omission in the bill as printed. I move that a new section 1 be added as follows:

Paragraph (k) of section 3 of the Dairy Industry Act, 1914, chapter 7, of the statutes of 1914, is amended by striking out the word "or", in the second last line thereof, and substituting the word "and" therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2 (new section 3)—Minimum standard of fat in butter.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Paragraph (d) provides that no person shall manufacture, import into Canada, or sell any milk or cream which contains any fat or oil other than that of milk. Would it not make it more clear if, after the word "cream',, the words "or substitute therefor" were inserted?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It would do no harm if my hon. friend wants to make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I move that the section be amended accordingly.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 5—Establishment of guilt for violation of act.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There may be some stocks of filled milk or filled cream on hand by some dealers and it was thought advisable that the section relating thereto might not come into force until the dealers have had time to get rid of those stocks. I therefore move that there be added to the bill as section 7 the following provision:

Section 3 (original section 2) of this act shall not come into effect until October 1st, 1923.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Thursday).

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Thursday, June 28, 1923.

The House met at eleven o'clock.

REPORT

Report of the Air Board for the year 1922—Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

REDISTRIBUTION

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the third report of the special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 15 to readjust the representation of the House of Commons. The report is as follows:

Wednesday, June 27, 1923.

The special committee, to whom was referred the Bill No. 15, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, beg leave to present the following as their third report:

Your committee held several meetings since its appointment on the 22nd of February last. The preparation of the schedules to be annexed to the said Bill was entrusted to sub-committees. The greater number of such sub-committees accomplished considerable work and have, from time to time, reported progress to your committee. It has been found, however, that differences of opinion exist, and your committee have decided that it would be unable to complete the schedules before prorogation.

They therefore have agreed to report back the Bill without amendment, and recommend that a similar committee be appointed at an early period at the next session of Parliament to consider such Bill.

Your committee also recommend that the letters, maps secured from the Department of the Interior and papers produced in the course of its proceedings remain in the possession of the clerk of the committee until the next session of Parliament, and that the same be produced by him at the first regular meeting of the newly-appointed committee.

Your committee also submit herewith a copy of the printed proceedings and evidence taken before them for the information of the House.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

E. M. MACDONALD,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. FRANCOIS J. PELLETIER (Matane): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) I move, seconded by Mr. Fournier (Bellechasse), that the fourth report of the Joint Committee on Printing of the Senate and House of Commons be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

HALIFAX OCEAN TERMINALS

*Mr. MacLAREN:

1. What is the policy of the Government with respect to capital requirements to complete the landing sheds and passenger station at the Halifax Ocean Terminals?

2. Have any arrangements been made for steamship sailings of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine between Canadian and American ports, and British and European ports for the season of 1924?

3. Has the National Railway management given the Government any assurance that unrouted shipments will be transported only through Canadian ports? If so, in what form has the assurance been given?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Paragraph 3 of question 3 was answered verbally yesterday. I am trying to get the other information and hope to have it to-day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The last paragraph of question 3 is dropped?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing to be gained by dropping it. Yesterday's answer had better appear with the answers to the other two paragraphs when they come.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not particular.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—COAL

Mr. HANSON:

1. What was the value of the coal purchased from the United States by the Canadian National Railways, including all routes or systems embraced in its operation, in the following fiscal years: 1920-1921, 1921-1922, and 1922-23?

2. How was the amount distributed among the various units of the Canadian National System?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I hope to have the answer to the first part to-day, but I do not think there is any possible chance of getting the information as to how the expenditure was distributed amongst the various units.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The answer to the first part is most important.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I have that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

CHARLES ED. BLONDIN

MR. HANSON:

1. Has Charles Ed. Blondin been dismissed as Postmaster at Pierreville, Quebec? If so, when and why?

2. Is the Government aware that the said C. E. Blondin is a returned soldier who served in the 22nd Battalion and was wounded in the battle of Amiens resulting in the loss of an arm?

3. Who has been appointed in the place of the said C. E. Blondin, or if no appointment has been made, who has been placed by the department in the position?

4. Is the person so placed related to one of the members of Parliament supporting the Government? If so, what is the relationship?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. No. Mrs. Boucher was dispossessed of the office on April 20, 1921, without investigation and without any order in council being passed for that purpose. Mr. Charles Edward Blondin was nominated by the Civil Service Commission for the postmastership of Pierreville on October 8, 1921, but the Department of Justice expressed an opinion on March 2, 1922, that the power of the Postmaster General to remove any postmaster without authority of the Governor-in-Council, had by implication been repealed by the provisions of section 28, sub-section 1 of the Civil Service Act, 1918. Consequently, no vacancy actually existed and the appointment of Mr. Blondin was invalid.

The facts are the following:—

On April 19, 1921, during a by-election in Yamaska County, in which Pierreville is situated, the following instructions were issued by the Honourable P. E. Blondin, Postmaster General: "Discharge Madame Boucher, postmistress at Pierreville on the ground that she has permitted strangers to handle the mail on its arrival in the post office on the 11th April and on other dates, contrary to the regulations, and appoint pro tem J. Simeon Letendre".

The stranger referred to was the son of the postmistress, who helped her on occasions to sort the mails, as he had been sworn in for that purpose. The date referred to in the Postmaster General's instructions on which the postmistress permitted a stranger to handle the mails in the post office, namely, April 11, 1921, was two days before the date on which the writ was issued for the by-election in Yamaska County, and for which election Mr. Aimé Boucher, the son, was a candidate. There is no evidence that Mr. Aimé Boucher helped his mother in the Yamaska post office on or after the date on which the writ was issued for the Yamaska election.

On receipt of the instructions from the Honourable Mr. Blondin, Postmaster General, Madame Boucher was removed from office on April 20, 1921, without any investigation being held, and without any order in Council being passed for that purpose.

Early in 1922, the question was raised as to the validity of this dismissal, and on the case being submitted to the Justice department, the ruling mentioned in answer No. 1, was given, on March 2, 1922. Upon receipt of this ruling, Mrs. Boucher was re-instated in office on March, 7, 1922.

2. The department is aware that Mr. Blondin was a returned soldier and a disability case.

3. See No. 1.

4. Mrs. Boucher is the mother of Aimé Boucher M.P. for Yamaska.

WILLIAM MANSFIELD

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Was there a man in the employ of the Department of Public Works previous to 1914 named William Mansfield?
2. When did he enter the service?
3. When was he dismissed from the service?
4. What position did he occupy before he was dismissed?
5. What were the reasons given for said dismissal?
6. By whom were these reasons given?
7. Was it claimed that he had dispersed patronage in the shape of work, to a Liberal?
8. In what town was said work being done?
9. What was the precise stand taken by J. A. Armstrong, ex-M.P., for Lambton, in connection with the said dismissal?
10. What was the attitude taken in reference to said dismissal by the superior officer of the said William Mansfield?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.
2. January, 1890.
3. September 11, 1914.
4. Inspector of heating and plumbing.

5 and 6. The departmental records do not state.

7, 8 and 9. In a report on file from the resident architect, Toronto, dated Sept. 4, 1914, it is stated: "What Mr. Armstrong, M.P. objects to is the bringing of a plumber from Sarnia which town is not in his constituency when there are plumbing firms in Petrolia competent to do the work."

10. There is on file a letter of September 15, 1914, from the late Mr. D. Ewart then chief architect, covering a communication from Mr. Mansfield, dated September 11, 1914. These two letters read as follows:—

"*Re* the dismissal of Mr. Wm. Mansfield, Inspector of Heating, etc., Dominion Public Buildings.

Having further reference to the above, I attach hereto a letter I have received from Mr. Mansfield, the enclosure speaks for itself.

I may state here that personally I have no knowledge whatever with regard to any occurrence in connection with the awarding of the work at the Petrolia public building. The instructions of Mr. Mansfield were, in this case, as usual, to consult local party in charge of patronage and to have the work required carried out."

"I am very much surprised to receive your letter of even date, dismissing me from the service of your department, seeing that I am not aware of any particular reason for this.

"I understand there has been some misunderstanding in connection with repairs to the heating apparatus in the public building at Petrolia and if this be the case I may state that I can readily explain what action I took with regard to that work, and show that whatever I did was in accordance with instructions received from the department and from the Liberal Conservative Patronage Committee of Petrolia, Ont."

PATRICK DESCHENEAUX

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has Patrick Descheneaux been dismissed as lighthouse keeper on St. Francis River? If so, when and why?
2. Is the Government aware that the said Patrick Descheneaux is a returned soldier who served with the 21st Quebec Regiment?
3. Who has been appointed in the place of the said Patrick Descheneaux?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes. He was dismissed by order in council of the 21st May, 1923, on the ground of political partisanship.

2. The department is not aware that he is a returned soldier. He was appointed by order in council April 10, 1912 to succeed Philias Desmarais, dismissed for political partisanship. There is no record in the department that he has been away from his work on military service.

3. A permanent appointment has not been made, but the matter is under the consideration of the Civil Service Commission. In the meantime, one Barthelemi Gladu is temporary keeper.

OFFICE OF AUDITOR GENERAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to call the attention of the House and of the government to the continued failure to fill the office of Auditor General of this country. The House realizes—certainly the country does—the supreme importance of this office. The late Auditor General died on the 8th January this year, close to six months ago. Previous to that it is worth observing, he had been ill, and consequently absent from his office since April 1, 1922, or very shortly after this government came into power. His absence from office, of course, I do not mention as attributable at all to the government or as due to any misconduct on their part, but it emphasizes the need of an earlier appointment after his decease. Six months have gone by, or nearly, and in the meantime, as has been very amply disclosed in parliament, moneys are being paid illegally. No supervision is being exercised, and the country's finances are virtually at the mercy of an unmanned auditor general's depart-

ment. I would like to know what defence the government makes for this failure.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): In the first place, the statement of the right hon. gentleman that moneys are being paid illegally is without foundation. I am satisfied that no moneys have been paid by the Auditor General's department except upon proper legal advice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister will give us a fiat we will show him whether it has been paid illegally or not.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend asks for a fiat; I do not know what he means. But I do know that the business of the Auditor General's office has been going on—shall I say—fairly satisfactorily. The Acting Auditor General is an old and capable official, and I will give one evidence of his activity: I remind the House that, if not for the first time, certainly for the first time in recent years, immediately after the meeting of parliament the Auditor General's report was laid on the Table. That is a compliment to pay to the Acting Auditor General. Some little time ago when this question was raised I said we were contemplating some legislation respecting the auditing of the country. That legislation has now been carried, and at a very early day the office of Auditor General will be filled. In the meantime any suggestion that the finances of the country are going to the dogs, that money is being paid out illegally and all that sort of thing, is purely a creation of the right hon. gentleman's imagination.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A favourite expression of the minister's. I will recall to him that I pointed out to the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) that if he would grant a fiat in one case the same would apply to at least four I know of; and as to how many I do not know of, of course I cannot speak. There is no excuse whatever for the position of Auditor General being vacant for six months and virtually vacant for a year and a half.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

CHARLES BLAKE, OF BRANDON

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct attention to the nature of returns brought down by this government. I have in my hand a return brought down in answer to an order of the House dated the 5th of March —brought down, I may say, a great length of time afterwards. The motion asked for the correspondence in any way relating to the withdrawal of professional work from the Inland Revenue department formerly performed by Charles Blake, of Brandon. The motion asked for a number of similar series of correspondence relating to the withdrawal of work from other returned soldiers and the giving of it to party followers. In the case of Blake the return states that there is no correspondence. I am in a position to state to the government that there is correspondence and that it is of no confidential character whatever. I have since been informed as to the writer of several letters addressed to the department which were not even answered.

Mr. JACOBS: They may have gone to the dead letter office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Dead government office.

Mr. FIELDING: No, the government is very much alive.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAYS

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): I would like to ask the government when the return requested two weeks ago respecting the St. Lawrence waterway will be brought down. In view of the great shortage of power in Ontario will the government during the recess of parliament take up with the government of the United States the further revision, adjustment and extension of the Niagara and St. Lawrence rivers for power purposes, and will negotiations be continued or reopened for the improvement of the St. Lawrence waterway? When will all the papers be brought down?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I had better say to my hon. friend that that will depend very largely on the representations made to the government of Canada by the government of the United States.

PULP EXPORT FROM FARMS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FRANK CAHILL (Pontiac): Is it the intention of the government to exempt from the operation of the legislation prohibiting the export of pulpwood the product of the land of settlers and farmers?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It has been represented to the government that the legislation passed has created a doubt in the minds of some of the farmers whether they will be pre-

vented from entering into contracts for the export of wood grown on their own farms. I wish to make it clear that any action the Government may take under the legislation will provide that wood grown by farmers on their property will be exempt from the provision prohibiting export.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PARIS OFFICES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Can the Minister of Railways tell us whether the American syndicate has taken up the option on our property in Paris?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways): In reply to my hon. friend I may say that I am not in a position to say.

ALLEGED UNREST IN WESTERN CANADA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): The Toronto Globe of Friday, June 22, contains a despatch from Windsor, where the meeting of police chiefs was held, alleging that Superintendent Page, of our Canadian National Railways, made a statement to that association that in western Canada there was the same state of unrest from the activity of Bolshevists and other Reds as was in Europe ten years ago. This is an untrue and defamatory statement concerning the labouring people of western Canada and western Canada as a whole. I ask the Minister of Railways whether he will investigate the matter and see if Superintendent Page actually made such a statement? And if that official did make such a statement will he be dismissed from the service?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister rises, may I ask whether the statement referred to labouring people? I did not catch that in the statement.

Mr. McMURRAY: It refers to the whole of western Canada, undoubtedly including the labouring people there.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): It is difficult to base a charge on a newspaper report that comes second or third hand. I do not know what Mr. Page did. I may say that to my mind the remark was very improper, but neither the government nor parliament has the engaging of the officials of the Canadian National Railways, outside of the directors. If that official made the statement referred to, I will direct the attention of members of the board to it.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

MOUNTED POLICE—OTTAWA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): I understand that the men who patrol the public buildings at Ottawa, the members of Division A, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, are working seven days in the week. As this is a matter entirely for federal jurisdiction and as indeed, in this case the government is the employer, is it not possible to ensure that these men will obtain one day's rest in seven?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The police come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), who is absent at the moment. I will draw his attention to the remarks of the hon. member, and he will doubtless give it such consideration as it merits.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask how long the "moment" is that the Minister of Justice is absent for? I understood he was absent for the rest of the session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know why my right hon. friend asks me the question if he knows the circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not like the hon. member, (Mr Woodsworth) to be given the impression that he might expect an answer later when the Minister of Justice is not to be back.

RATES ON COAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I notice in the Ottawa Journal a statement quoted from the report of the Mines and Minerals committee which says:

> Your committee suggests that the rates quoted—

Referring to rates quoted by the railway officers.

> —are not cost rates but much higher.

I take this as an insinuation against the railway officials who appeared before the committee, and I dissent from that report. I think it ill becomes any member of this parliament to make such insinuations against the officers of our Canadian National Railway who cannot come here to defend themselves.

SALES TAX—THE UNION JACK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. D. DRUMMOND (West Middlesex): I wish to put a question to the government, particularly to the Minister of Finance, with regard to a matter that has been brought to

my attention from various sources, namely, the application of the sales tax to the purchase of the Union Jack. I did not know that the tax did apply in that case. I ask the Minister whether it does, and if so would the government not consider it advisable to remove the application of the sales tax from our national flag.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I regret that my hon. friend's zeal for the Union Jack comes up at such a late stage; I think the matter is important enough to have been the subject of reference earlier in the session. I can give my hon. friend no assurance on the question. The law is the law and we shall have to enforce it, even if it imposes a tax on the Union Jack. I am as much an admirer of the Union Jack as my hon. friend is, but I want the Union Jack to be a symbol of the enforcement of the laws of the country.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SECURITIES.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 244, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act, 1919.

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

On Section 2—Form, term and amount of securities to be approved.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The apparent effect of the bill—I say the apparent effect, because I dare say my hon. friend will have some answer to the statement—is to change the law only in one particular, namely, as to the right to endorse securities and to pledge the credit of the country. Section 26 of the act already controls the issue of these securities. The main provision here is for government control, and the next thing we have is the guarantee. Subsection 2 of this section reads:

> No securities, as defined in this section including in such definition equipment certificates or obligations in any form intended to be issued to the public, shall be issued for the purposes of or by the company or any of the companies designated in the schedule hereto except those approved as to form, terms and amount by the Governor in Council.

That is the first change made by the amendment to section 26, which already provides that the issue of bonds, debentures and securities can only be made with the approval of the Governor in Council. On that point, therefore, there is really no change in the law. The real change is to be found in subsection 3, which reads:

> The said securities so approved may be guaranteed by His Majesty and any such guarantee may be in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine, and may be signed by the Minister or Acting Minister of Finance on behalf of His Majesty.

This raises in a very serious form the same question that has already been discussed in connection with the act this year providing for railway construction. It was pointed out that under that act the government could make its advances and give its guarantees without including the amount in the estimates and without further authority from parliament. It can be said at least that that act defined the railways to some extent; it afforded a starting point and an ending point. It did not say how the lines were to go, it is true, but apart from that the provision had some definiteness. But here we have a blank cheque given to the government by parliament. Otherwise, why is the change made? Securities were guaranteed before without any trouble, on the authority of parliament given by enactment each year. If this is not a blank cheque, what is it for? If there is one way in which the project of the Canadian National Railways can be ruined it is by causing the people to lose confidence in it through their amazement at the things that are being done. I say that previously we had no difficulty on any question of new commitments, whether of security or of cash. These were new ventures; these were things that ought to be, we thought, considered by parliament. We ought to have some control over the capital issues and the capital activities. We were opposed, not on that score but on the ground that we would not give any details as to the management in such a way as to injure the operations of the companies. To-day the government not only take the stand which they formerly condemned, that is in favour of independence of management, they not only want independence of management, but they want the country's credit absolutely removed from the control of parliament. If there ever was a time when this proposition should be looked into closely and strictly that time is now. My hon. friends opposite say they have taken the National system out of politics. Why, they have thrown it into politics. I should like to know any better way of making this a political matter than appointing a purely political board. That is what we have. Keep it out of politics! Why, it is in politics now. Does anyone suggest that the Premier could give Mr. Sinclair any hints in the game of practical politics, as applied in connection with the operation of the line down in Nova Scotia? Does he think he could teach Mr. Dawson,

manager of Reform campaigns in British Columbia, anything about practical politics in that province? Again, does he think he could teach Mr. Gough anything about practical politics in Ontario? Why, the only claims of these gentlemen to appointment were that they were good political hacks. That is all, and nothing else. Now we are to have a combination with this political railway board under which the government will have the right to pledge the credit of the country to any securities that the government's political friends may see fit to put forward and the government may see fit to approve of. If it is not for the purpose of getting this large over-holding right why have this legislation? No difficulty has been experienced in the past. What is the reason for the legislation to-day?

Mr. FIELDING: If it were not for the fact that my hon. friend is usually in a very genial frame of mind I would be tempted to apply to him that quotation with which we are all familiar, "Suspicion haunts the guilty mind." My hon. friend has read into this bill things which are not there, and which can only be carried into it by an extraordinary flight of the imagination. I am not going to discuss the political question at all. This is a business proposition, and I am going to confine my remarks entirely to the bill. My hon. friend has been wandering away from the question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not very far.

Mr. FIELDING: He wants to know whether Mr. A., Mr. B., or Mr. C. is a worthy man for the position. He has no right to reflect upon the character of these men. Those of them I know personally are high-minded gentlemen. He mentioned in particular Mr. Sinclair. There is no more honourable man in the Dominion of Canada than Mr. Sinclair, and the suggestion that he will not faithfully and honourably discharge his duty as a commissioner for the National railways is entirely unwarranted. I am sure that on reflection my hon. friend will see—and the same remark applies to the other commissioners—that what he has said is not justified. Now this bill—and it is only with the bill that I am concerned—says that no securities shall be issued by the National Railway Company or the subsidiaries connected with it except by the consent of the Governor General in Council. The hon. gentleman says that is already provided for. Possibly it is. In that case the worst that can be said of this legislation, as I remarked the other day, is that it is surplusage. If, however, the power is required at any time it is there. Will my hon. friend tell me what harm can come by stating definitely that under no conditions shall that board issue securities without coming to the government? What is wrong with such a provision as that? My hon. friend says the power is not needed. Whether we have it or not is debatable—I am not sure that we do have that power already,—but in any event what harm will be done by this legislation? That is the first purpose of the bill. Can anybody object to it? Surely not for a moment. I do not know on what ground the hon. gentleman bases his argument. How in the world can he connect this bill with some of the things he is talking about I fail to discover.

The next purpose of the bill is that the government may issue guarantees. This measure does not give the government power to do anything except to guarantee securities that can be legally issued. Now, if the Canadian National Railway Company has any power, given by this parliament, to issue a security it is better that that security should have the approval of the government and thus sell at a good price. That is the whole story. This bill does not give the government power to guarantee any issue that is not already authorized by parliament. I do not expect the power is going to be used to any extent at all. My hon. friend is imagining difficulties. I think it was the leader of the Opposition who said that the old borrowing powers had been extinguished. Well, I am advised that even that is a debatable matter. I am advised that some of these outstanding companies, subsidiaries of the Canadian National Railways, are still distinct entities and have powers and rights of their own. We certainly do not intend that these companies shall issue any bonds. There will be no guarantee given on any bond issue that is not authorized by this parliament. What greater assurance could my hon. friend ask? Now, they say this legislation is not necessary——

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. gentleman mean by the expression "authorized by parliament?" Suppose this bill passes, what will the company have to do to get a bond issue authorized by parliament?

Mr. FIELDING: If they have no legal authority to issue a bond, if they are not authorized by this parliament to do so, there will be no bond issue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they have it now.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my right hon. friend say they have not the power now? If so that ends it. If they have no legal right to issue bonds there will be no guarantee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Assuming they have the right what will they have to do, after this bill passes, to get an unlimited bond issue?

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend is now reversing his own argument. Only a moment ago he was claiming that this power did not exist.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let my hon. friend take it any way he likes.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend can have it either way, but not both ways. He has already stated that in the case of these companies the borrowing powers are extinguished. If so there can be no bond issue. How does my right hon. friend get away from that argument. I have already given my hon. friends an assurance in that respect. What more do they want? My right hon. friend thinks there is no need of this power at all. I will give him an illustration showing to the contrary. To-day there is a requirement of the Canadian National Railway for $15,000,000 on equipment bonds. I am advised that there is no authority under the law to guarantee these bonds. It is the only security that I contemplate will be guaranteed. I am told there is no authority under the existing law for the Governor in Council to guarantee these bonds and if they are to be issued, and they must be issued lawfully, it is better that they should bear the guarantee of the government of Canada and command a good price on the market than that they should have to be sold at a sacrifice. That is the whole story; there is nothing else behind it in the world. The suggestion of my hon. friends that this is a scheme devised for new guarantees for new and unauthorized securities is without any foundation whatever. That I can assure my hon. friends in all sincerity and good faith.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I doubt—and, I confess it, with some feeling of despair—whether I can succeed in convincing the minister, but I should like to convince the House. I am not certain that I can do that but I am going to do the best I can. Of the state of the law I do not think there is any doubt, but it does not matter a particle whether there is or not, so far as the merits of this legislation go. It is not always an easy matter to make a legal proposition clear. Fortunately, in this case it does not matter which end of the dilemma the hon. gentleman takes, not in the least. He says, first of all, that he wants to secure government control of bond issues of the Canadian National Railway Company, and I ask the House to remember there is only one such company which was created by the statutes of 1919, chapter 13. That company has included in its system other companies. Those companies had their own charters from parliament and their own powers, the parent company gets no power from those. That is my opinion. I do not care whether it is accepted or not, its acceptance or otherwise does not matter in the least. We are dealing in this bill with the parent company and no other, hon. members only need to read the bill to see that. The bill deals with the parent company and only the parent company. I say the parent company never had power to issue a dollar of security without the approval of the Governor in Council, and never issued a dollar, and how in the world the most elementary first-form student in the government can think of anything else I do not know. I do not think any of them do think anything else, and I will say what I really think in a minute. Section 26 which starts this way—

> The company—

The company is defined in the act. Nobody suggests that the company means anything except the Canadian National Railway Company.

> The company may with the approval of the Governor in Council issue bonds.

How can anything be more specific? It is just the language that is used here. This says that no security can be issued unless the form, and so on, are approved by the Governor-in-Council It may be asked, why is this put in? It is just put in as a smoke screen to get the second section through—no other reason at all. There is no more reason for that first clause than there is for the hon. minister to take an excerpt from a novel and put it there. It is merely as something to introduce the second section. The government thought it would look just a little too naked, and the object would be a little too clear if the second section appeared there alone. Let us come to the second section. The second section says that once they get the approval of the Governor-in-Council, which they always had to get, the government might guarantee the bonds. I have never objected to the government having power to guarantee the bonds. I do not object to it. I do not think there is the slightest need of it. The government has the power to-day to guarantee the bonds. If anybody has any doubt about it, I will accept his doubt and assume they have not the power. Does the minister

not know we have to guarantee them over and over again? Why did he not tell the House last session of the brilliant sale he made in New York of government guaranteed bonds? Does he imagine the counsel for the purchasers did not examine the authority of the guarantee, to be sure it was legal? Why, of course they did, and there has never been a question raised that I have heard that they had the power to guarantee. But let me assume they have not the power, that somebody in the Justice department or in the Railway department has told them there may be a little doubt about having the power to guarantee. I will assume he is right. Here is what they are doing. They are taking the power to do it, without including the amount of the guarantee in the estimates, something which they never did before. That is the whole effect of the legislation. Just add to it that they have to place the amount of the guarantee in the estimates, and the government will reject the bill, and that is what they do not want to do. Why should this be? The minister did not mention it. Why does he not want that? Why did he not put it in the estimates? I do not see the object unless he wants to make the estimates appear low to the country and take carte blanche himself to give any guarantees he likes. The minister thinks it will be more advantageous to himself, his government or his party. I do not know why. The minister says we are very suspicious. Well, what is an opposition for?

Mr. FIELDING: To be reasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, to be reasonable. I will take the reason from the mouth of the minister himself. He called attention to the absence of this in a bill four years ago. I am not sure that he himself did it, but I am pretty sure that he did. I know the Prime Minister did. I know we acceded to it.

Mr. FIELDING: What restrictions will the hon. member put in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That the amount of the guarantee shall be put in and voted by parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: I will deal with that in a minute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a wonder the minister did not mention it. I am prepared to let it go through, if that restriction is applied. That is all I am fighting for. Why should the minister not accept it?

Mr. FIELDING: Go on and finish and I will answer.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister might tell me now.

Mr. FIELDING: We are getting back to the old trouble. I am asked, why should we not put the guarantee in the estimates? Because it has never been the practice of parliament to put guarantees in the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING: In the annual vote that we make there is a provision including guarantees within the limitation of that vote; but the general powers to guarantee the bonds of the company are not usually expressed; and in the estimates there is no departure from the custom. The only exception you will find is in the regular vote for the railways, where the sum is voted, and you may apply that vote by cash or guarantee or any other way. But the statement that the guarantees of the Canadian Northern have always been voted in the estimates is absolutely at variance with the facts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is simply wrong.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not wrong. My hon. friend will find that every act to guarantee the bond of a railway company has been an act in itself, and not shown in the estimates. And that is reason and common sense. What are the purposes of the bill? The hon. member says we have the power already to prevent the issue of bonds, without the consent of the Governor in Council. That may be debatable. I am advised there is a doubt about that. But assuming there is no doubt about it, will the hon. member tell me what harm is done when we make assurance doubly sure by making it clear this railway company shall not issue any securities without the knowledge and approval of the Governor in Council. What is wrong with that? Nothing. We come to the guarantee. We can only guarantee bonds which are lawfully issued, and if any bond is to be lawfully issued by the Canadian National railway, that is the bond of the government of Canada. If it is issued simply as the bond of the Canadian National Railway, it has only a diminished value. Since we are going to be responsible for it, why should we not make it in a form and condition which will enable us to sell it at the best price? That is the whole story. I will cite a case in point. My hon. friend says we have all the power. We have not. I am advised that with regard to the Canadian National equipment which the commission require, we have not the power to supply it

without this bill. Without this bill the bonds would be sold in the market without the guarantee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To a lot of what the minister has said, no reply is necessary.

Mr. FIELDING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not care whether he is right or wrong; that is as to having the power to guarantee the equipment bonds. If he is right it serves my purpose just as well. If he is wrong, if he feels he needs additional power, I do not object to give it to him at all. But when he says this is what has always been done —unlimited of guarantee—

Mr. FIELDING: Not unlimited power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is the limit?

Mr. FIELDING: They can only guarantee the bonds where lawfully issued and the onus will be on the party issuing them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they should issue bonds for $5,000,000, have they not the power to issue them?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is the restraint?

Mr. FIELDING: They can only guarantee a bond that is lawfully issued and the proposal to issue $5,000,000 of bonds without legislative authority certainly would not come within the provisions of the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without any legislative authority?—Have they not just as much legislative authority to issue bonds for $5,000,000,000 as for $5,000,000?

Mr. FIELDING: No, the legislative authority will apply in each case. There is no power to issue for $5,000,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no special authority for any bond here—none whatever—no authority for a bond for $1,000. And there is just as much authority for a bond of $5,000,000,000. They have power to issue such bonds to-day, if they have power to issue anything. Consequently there is no limit here to the power of the guarantee. The whole point is this—and I ask the House not to be confused by the introduction of any other matter—whether the amount should be in the estimates or not. The minister says it never has been in the estimates, and he says we have given railway guarantees without it. The latter statement is right, but we never gave a guarantee to the Canadian National without it, and this bill is to guarantee the Canadian National railway bonds. Certainly, every time when we guaranteed the bonds of private companies we did not include it in the estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is changing his ground.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, and no one in this House thinks I am. What I say is this, that we have always included in the estimates, our guarantees as well as our cash advances. The minister cannot point to a dollar that was ever guaranteed the Canadian National that we failed to put right in the Estimates, so that the country knew the amount. I want to know why the minister wants that changed. What is the effect of all this? The minister, if this legislation passes, can guarantee just at his will, and the country will have no knowledge whatsoever, that is, in compact and unified form, of what the country's commitments to our National railways are. Instead of making cash advances each year to the railways and putting that in the Estimates if this legislation passes, the company can issue bonds, and the minister will guarantee them.

Mr. FIELDING: That is nonsense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He will do that. Why should we pass legislation to let him do nonsense whether he wants it or not? I do not attribute lack of intelligence to the minister, but he cannot suggest honestly that he should have power to do that.

Mr. FIELDING: I say that we would have no power to do it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is hopeless, if he takes a position of that sort.

Mr. FIELDING: I know he is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why would he not have power? Will he tell me anything he has not power to do if this passes? And then I will suggest something a minute afterwards.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. gentleman had better make his minute-afterwards suggestion now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right. I will suggest the alternative now. Supposing the company issue a $15,000,000 equipment bond and the minister guarantees that. He says that if this passes, the company will have power to do that and the minister will have power to guarantee it.

Mr. FIELDING: Not by this legislation. The company have the power already. All we ask is the power to guarantee the bond.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not bothering about that. I am not asking about that. If this legislation passes, the company will have

power to issue such a bond, and the minister will have power to guarantee it.

Mr. FIELDING: The power to issue is not in this legislation; the power to guarantee is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference? There is not a particle of difference. I am afraid the minister is trying to mislead the House.

Mr. FIELDING: That is unkind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will put the matter in this way. They have the power now to issue bonds, and if this legislation passes, the government has power to guarantee them. Supposing, instead of issuing bonds to cover equipment, they issued bonds to cover the deficit for the year—suppose they have a deficit of $10,000,000, and that they issue a bond for $50,000,000 instead of $15,000,000. The bond covers equipment and deficit. Does the minister say that if this legislation passes, the company will have power to do that, and he will have power to guarantee the bond?

Mr. FIELDING: I have some difficulty in understanding what my right hon. friend is driving at. I cannot understand that we have power to guarantee anything that is not already authorized by parliament. The Canadian National Railway Act does not deal specifically with equipment bonds. This is only an illustration. Equipment bonds are not issued in the usual way; they are not covered by an ordinary guarantee, and therefore it is desirable, if we want those bonds to be sold at the best market price, that they should be put before the public in the best possible form. If this bill does not pass, what will happen? The Canadian National Railways will issue $15,000,000 worth of equipment bonds on their own credit. They are a good class of bond. If they are issued on the New York market, they will not, perhaps, benefit very much by a guarantee. If they are issued on the Canadian market, the Canadian government guarantee will be helpful. The question is: Which of the two ways should we, who have the responsibility of dealing with the matter, pursue—put the bonds on the market in such a shape that they will command the highest price, or issue them with the full knowledge that they are going to be sold at a sacrifice price?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the Minister keep saying that, instead of answering the question in the form in which he asked for it himself? I do not object to his guaranteeing the bonds. Can I repeat that too often?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I showed, I think, to everyone who wants to understand and who approaches the matter impartially, that either as the act now is, or as it will be when amended—I do not care which—the company can issue any bonds so long as the government approves.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could they issue a bond for a deficit?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly they could, with the approval of the government, issue a bond to pay their debts.

Mr. GRAHAM: A great bond!

Mr. MEIGHEN: With the approval of the government, they can issue a bond to pay their debts. That would be the least objectionable. Supposing they issued a bond for equipment to any extent whatever, say to $100,000,000, does the Minister suggest that they would not have power to do that?

Mr. GRAHAM: It seems clear to me. My right hon. friend—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why cannot the Minister answer that, "yes" or "no"?

Mr. GRAHAM: If the right hon. member does not want my answer, all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let him answer anyway he likes, but I do not understand why he cannot answer, "yes" or "no". The Minister is trying to confuse the House over this bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend is trying to confuse the House, but he is not making a good shot at that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If this bill passes, the company can issue bonds to any extent at all, and the government do not need to come to parliament and show what they are going to guarantee for a single year. All I ask is that the latter be conceded, and I give this House warning now, that no such power has ever before been given to a government in relation to our roads and no such power should be given. It is going to tend to confuse the country and parliament as to the actual financial history of the railways. It is going to change the whole method of presenting to the country the record of our railways. That is the purpose of it. Let hon. members read page 33 of the Estimates for last year, or practically the same page of the Estimates for this year. Let them read how the Estimates read in previous years, showing that the amount every time included not only the cash advances, but the guarantees. That had to be done.

12 noon

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister says, "no". It did. There is no use in telling the Minister anything.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the Minister show me a dollar that was guaranteed that was not included in the Estimates. If he gets up, he will likely go back to private roads.

Mr. FIELDING: I will go back to the facts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let him adhere to the Canadian National Railways and tell me of a dollar that was guaranteed or a dollar that was advanced that was not included in the Estimates and authorized in the Estimates by parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: The annual appropriation to make up what is estimated to be the possible deficit of the Canadian National Railways includes the statement that the advances to be made may be by loan, or by cash, or in any other way. It does not have reference to transactions like this at all. The right hon. gentleman got wrong first, and he has been wandering around ever since and trying to get right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman look at the very details given in the Estimates. It covers:

(*a*) Operating deficits whenever incurred or ascertained.

(*b*) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies.

Equipment.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What?

Mr. FIELDING: Go on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what is wrong with the minister. (Reading):

(*c*) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations.

(*d*) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured.

(*e*) Construction and betterments.

Is that the annual deficit on operations?

(*f*) Co-ordination or consolidation on railway lines and facilities.

(*g*) Guarantees of securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Everything is included, and the whole of the Estimates there includes what the government does by cash or guarantee in relation to anyone of them.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. gentleman began by getting wrong as to the relation between Estimates and railway appropriations. He began with a statement, made with a great flourish of trumpets, that previously the appropriations for these various purposes had been shown in the Estimates, and he flourished the Estimates. Then also with a modest flourish of trumpets, we pointed out that millions have been provided for railway aid without being shown in the Estimates. When he was beaten on that ground, he shifted around to the other.

Mr MEIGHEN: The minister knows right well and this House knows, that I have discussed from the beginning the Canadian National Railways and nothing else. There has been no shifting of ground, and I will not let anyone, who does not want to be, be confused by what the minister is trying to say about my shifting ground. I have referred to that and to that alone, and from the beginning stated I had no reference to our conduct as related to private roads.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend did not make any qualification at the beginning.

Mr. MEIGHEN: None was needed.

Mr. FIELDING: When I stated that appropriations for railway subsidies were not shown in the Estimates, he said I was mistaken; then he revised that and said he did not know. We have on the order paper today a resolution authorizing the loan of $10,000,000 to the harbour commission of Montreal. We have voted these appropriations again and again and not one is shown in the Estimates, and the hon. gentleman knows it. Therefore his contention that every appropriation is shown in the Estimates is absolutely wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never so contended.

Mr. FIELDING: Another point. The Railway department, following the usual practice, contemplated the issue of these bonds—as they had power to do—and they did not include them in the estimates sent to us. But they had the power to issue these fifteen million dollars' worth of bonds, and all we do by this bill is to say: Instead of issuing these bonds in the name of the Canadian National Railways, and selling them at a sacrifice, you shall have endorsed on them the guarantee of the government of Canada, and so sell them at a good price. That is the whole story.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minster's effort is getting plain. I have argued this on the basis of National Railway appropriations; in respect to other matters the question is not affected at all. If in the past we have had advances for harbour improvements and the like authorized by statute and not included in the Estimates, then there is going to be no confusion in making comparisons; but in relation to our railways, from this time on

there will be kept out of the Estimates those things that were always in before. It is just as plain to the minister as to anybody else, but he has got to make a fight to get this through. He is determined to exclude these from the Estimates where they have always been in relation to our National Railways. If he thinks equipment is not included in supplies for railways, all right, put it in; but put it in where it has always been before, and where it ought to be in the Estimates. Let him amend his Supplementary Estimates and put it there, and I will raise no objection at all. Now it is plain what the minister wants.

Mr. FIELDING: It is, but it is not plain what my hon. friend wants.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if we connot agree upon some things without any unnecessary heat. After all, there ought to be no real object in anyone trying to mislead this House upon what is really a matter very important to public business. In connection with the railways we embarked upon something which is entirely new. It did not have anything to do with railway subsidies for private companies. It had absolutely nothing to do with advances to the Montreal Harbour Commission. It was something which, as I say, was not only entirely novel, but it was the particular business of the country; it was something that we were doing ourselves. It was not any question of how many thousand dollars per mile this House had authorized the government to guarantee for the Canadian Pacific Railway; it was our own business, the management and running of our own lines. We went about it under the act of 1919. We had extracts read the other day from the debate upon that act, and it was shown that the point had been raised under the statutes of 1919, that parliamentary control of capital account ought to be maintained. Why, the present Prime Minister said that the last vestige of parliamentary control would disappear if that was not done, and the then government very cheerfully agreed at once; they never expected anything else.

My hon. friend says that this has never been in the Estimates. I am sure he does not mean it. I want to give my friend every credit for sincerity just as long as it is possible for me to do so, and I think what he means is that the ordinary guarantees of privately-owned railway bonds did not appear in the Estimates. I tell the House that I believe absolutely that not one single guarantee was given, so far as I know, that was not included in the bulk amount voted by parliament. Does my hon. friend dispute that statement?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. FIELDING: Go on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like to get this thing cleared up, to get rid of the mists and come down to facts. If my hon. friend disputes that statement, now is the time for him to do so.

Mr. FIELDING: Go on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good, there is no dispute.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, it cannot be disputed. Why, my hon. friend himself shows how it cannot be disputed. This year a different plan has been adopted. He himself a few minutes ago, speaking on this very question of the Estimates, says that this year the fifteen million dollars is not included in his seventy-two million dollars. We had an equipment guarantee last year—it was included without any such bill as this.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is wrong. We had no guarantee last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Did not my hon. friend guarantee the equipment securities that he reported to the House last session and sold in New York?

Mr. FIELDING: They were not equipment securities. My hon. friend is all wrong in the facts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of securities were they?

Mr. FIELDING: They were securities of the Canadian Northern Railway at one stage, afterwards they were securities of the Dominion government, upon which we borrowed one hundred million dollars.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was not speaking of those securities, but it makes no difference.

Mr. FIELDING: It does.

Mr. GRAHAM: Were there any equipment bonds guaranteed last year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It makes no difference whether it is equipment or whether it is any other kind of security that is guaranteed, the principle is exactly the same. They may not have been equipment securities, but they were railway securities, and they were guaranteed without such legislation as this, simply because the amount of the guarantee was included in the Estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: No, my recollection is that it was not included in the Estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure my hon. friend will find that they were. If he could do so without their being included in the Estimates, however, what earthly justification is there for this bill? The whole idea of this measure is to see that the securities are sold properly. Were not the securities sold properly at that time? Did not my hon. friend get a good price for them? Of course, they were in the Estimates. The wording was carefully worked out to cover all these things, and my hon. friend practically admits it in his own statement when he says that this fifteen million dollars is not included in this main vote. Those having been included in the main vote, he had a right to guarantee them. I ask the government to look at page 31 of their own Estimates of this year and ask themselves whether that means anything except that power is taken for the purpose of guaranteeing securities of all classes. Why, we can even guarantee securities for operating deficits; it is not done, I know, but it could be done. The vote says, "Acquisition of property, materials and supplies," and to wind it up you have an omnibus provision, "guarantees of securities." The government said: We ask for all this and we agree to keep ourselves within the limit that parliament sets upon it. Then the estimate becomes a statute thus making the provisions enacted perfectly valid and binding. In fact that is how the business has always been done.

I am at a loss to understand my hon. friend's position. Bonds and securities have been successfully sold in the past without this act; he himself has done it. Yet he tells us that the whole object of this act is to enable the sale of securities. Why, his own record shows that that is nonsense, that his argument is pure piffle. This question of giving a blank cheque to the administration is a novel thing. We were told in connection with the construction programme that one reason why this unlimited power should be given was that works were contemplated which would run over more than one year and that the only proper thing to do was to arrange for the whole matter at once. That was the only argument that amounted to anything in connection with that bill, and that argument does not apply here at all. The only possible object of this legislation is to enable the government to put themselves in a position to do just what they please. What the Minister of Railways said is quite right, that there is a distinction between the right to issue a security and the right to guarantee, and it is also true that under this provision the government should only guarantee bonds which may be legally issued by the corporation. But under the statutory borrowing powers of the company they may raise $75,000 a mile on their whole mileage. I forget the exact figures of the existing bonded indebtedness per mile; the Minister of Railways will know it—but I venture to say that the exact amount of securities issued is much below $75,000 per mile.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that is true.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it is true; the minister admits it. Up to the extent, then, of $75,000 per mile the right to issue exists and the right to guarantee is given. There is no limit so far as the issue of bonds for equipment purpose is concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is my hon. friend clear that the Canadian National Railway Company could issue securities against the Canadian Northern system? Legally and technically the Canadian Northern system has never been brought into the Canadian National system.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am surprised to hear that; I understood, the last time this subject was discussed, that we now had proper co-ordination.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are certain difficulties concerning a portion of the stock which the government is taking steps to get possession of. It had not got the possession yet, and legally and technically the Canadian Northern is not, as I am advised, a part of the Canadian National Railway system. That is why I asked the question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the act which deals with the question of borrowing powers makes that perfectly clear. If there is any doubt about it, I do not see how securities have been sold in the past. They have been sold under this act and they have been regarded by very eminent New York counsel as perfectly good securities. The act says that the company may with the approval of the Governor in Council issue bonds and debentures, then it takes out from the application of the computation of $75,000 a mile the government railways, but it leaves everything else in. The schedule specifically mentions the Canadian Northern and a great many other companies.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be when they are in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no limit, except the proper business limit; there is no legal limit to the issue of securities against equipment. The equipment itself forms the security.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government by an estimate, I think, provided that twenty-five per cent of the balance could be issued by the company.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In this legislation we are getting away from the provision of these things in the Estimates, and the fact is that there will be no limit. Are we going to do something which was excused the other day only because it covered a three-year programme and the work could not be done all at once? Are we going to do something which changes all our previous practice? Are we going to write this blank cheque to the government?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend began his observations by saying he was unable to understand my position. Well, I think I can understand his; he got in wrong at the beginning and he is now trying to maintain an utterly indefensible position. What is the issue? This resolution does not create the power to issue any securities; not a dollar can be issued under this bill. If there is an outstanding authority granted by parliament to the Canadian National Railway Company to issue bonds, then in the judgment of the Governor in Council those bonds may be guaranteed. That is the essential feature. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) and the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) say that every obligation that is assumed, every guarantee and every appropriation, must be shown in the Estimates; that is the great principle they are struggling for. Then my hon. friend in vain tried to bolster up that argument by saying that a year or two ago we issued an equipment security guarantee; why not do it now? Well, the answer is that we did not issue an equipment security guarantee then; he is materially wrong in his facts. Then he says that we issued guaranteed securities in New York at another time and asks why we should not do so now. We issued securities which were guaranteed by act of the parliament of Canada in the name of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. There was a law providing for it, and the issue was made under the provisions of that law. My hon. friend did the same thing a year or two ago and did not show it in the Estimates. He issued a guarantee for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and for the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and he did not show it in the Estimates; he did not do the thing he now says is essential.

Sir. HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend be kind enough to give particulars of any guarantee we made that was not shown in the Estimates?

Mr. FIELDING: I say he issued two loans —and I am not criticising him—guaranteed in the city of New York, one for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and one for the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and to the best of my knowledge and belief neither was shown in the Estimates. It is not customary to show guarantees in the Estimates. So in relation to all these material facts my hon. friend is wrong. Now, the whole story is this—and I repeat: not a dollar of bonds can be issued under this legislation. If there is already an authority to issue bonds, is it better that they should go on the market at a sacrifice price, or is it better that we should put the endorsation of the government upon them and sell at the best possible price?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to tell my hon. friend that so far as these Canadian government bonds he refers to are concerned, they were included in the total amount of the Estimates, and we never exceeded it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Never what?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They were included in the Estimates. It is true they were not included by name.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the "oh" for? We do not ask in this case that it be included by name; we simply ask that the country know what the total payment is, that is all. My hon. friend makes a splurge about the matter of equipment, but so far as that is concerned it does not make the slightest difference. These loans were made under previously existing powers, and there was no trouble. The whole truth is that the minister wants to get away from this limitation. What is the use of talking about wanting to issue bonds so that they will sell well; they were sold well before. That has nothing to do with it. I started out to give some reasons for this change, and I could give others, as I am sure my hon. friend could himself give them. For example, was there anything but a political reason for the appointment of the gentleman who now represents the city of Quebec on the board?

Mr. FIELDING: What has that to do with this matter?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everything; they are the people with whom you have to deal; people in your own class, in your own scale.

Mr. FIELDING: Thank you.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: People into whose hands you put the whole of these matters. Take it out of politics, yes—and put it in the hands of your political followers.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Did I understand my hon. friend to say that the appointment of the gentleman representing the city of Quebec on the board was a political one?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I asked whether there were any but political reasons for the appointment. The gentleman was the former member for Bellechasse, Colonel Talbot. We had a series of questions to try to find out something in this connection and there was some difficulty in getting at the facts; I think there were three series before we got them. We found that this gentleman had been given a position in the pay of the Quebec government at $2,000 a year; that he had remained in that position and has since been made one of the directors of the Canadian National system, his emolument thus being increased from $2,500 to $4,500 a year. My question was a perfectly innocent one; I merely asked if there were any except political reasons for his appointment.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I can tell my hon. friend the reason for the appointment of a representative of the city of Quebec on the board. The city and district of Quebec were so badly neglected by the late government, in which my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, that they were entitled to have someone to represent their interests.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree entirely with that.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: We are perfectly satisfied with the appointment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no doubt that you should have representation, but I would point out that when the matter was discussed before, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) said that the nomination came as a complete surprise.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion of the board of directors at this stage is out of order. The matter under consideration is the question of guarantees. Shall section 2 carry?

Mr. EVANS: I have been trying to understand this question from the controversy that has been going on, but I do not know even yet whether the Minister of Finance has told the whole story. As I understand it, the purpose of this act is to give the government power to issue these equipment certificates or obligations without the consent of parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: The power is there already. All this gives is the right to guarantee.

Mr. EVANS: This will be done without the consent of parliament?

Mr. FIELDING: This is the consent of parliament now.

Mr. EVANS: Then the power is to be given to issue these guarantees without the consent of parliament and without having the amounts placed in the Estimates?

Mr. FIELDING: Oh no, no.

Mr. EVANS: If that is so it is a dangerous precedent to create.

Mr. FIELDING: I assure my hon. friend that this legislation creates no power to issue securities. If any security already authorized by parliament is to be issued, the government may in their wisdom guarantee it; that is the whole story. It guarantees nothing in the future; the legislation is confined entirely to authority already issued by parliament. We cannot grant a guarantee on anything not already authorized by parliament.

Mr. STEVENS: With respect to the financial railway commitments of this session, as I understand it we are committed in the main estimates to $73,000,000 for deficits and so forth. We are committed by the bill of the other day to $28,000,000 for construction. We are making a committal now for $15,000,000 or more for equipment, making a total of committals in respect of the National Railways for this year of $116,000,000, part of which will be expended over a period of approximately three years. That is, I think, a correct statement. The House should keep it in mind that unquestionably next year we shall be asked to make other commitments in the matter of extensions, equipment, and so forth, so that while the expenditure may be over three years, during those three years other commitments will be added. My point is simply this and I wish to make it clear that this session the parliament of Canada is committing the country to an expenditure of $116,000,000 to cover deficits, equipment bonds and new construction of branch lines for the National Railways.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is at all events not correct in regard to the equipment; we are not by this legislation assuming any new obligations; the power to issue the bonds for equipment purposes exists to-day. We have the choice of allowing those bonds to be issued without the guarantee and sold at a low price, or of putting our guarantee upon them and getting the best price. That is the story of the equipment bonds.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely the minister does not want to make the committee believe that we are not committing the country to expenditure, whether it is by guarantee, voting the estimates, or any other way.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is mistaken. The country has already authorized the issue of these bonds. If we do not put on the guarantee the bonds will still be issued, but they will be sold at a depreciated price, that is all.

Mr. STEVENS: I understand that perfectly, but I am not going to be—what shall I say?—diverted from this fact, and I want the committee to get it: under the present legislation certainly the bonds can be issued, and under the statutory legislation and the Estimates the bonds can be guaranteed. Now, let me state the case again: Under the statutory powers of the Estimates we are guaranteeing or paying out of consolidated fund, one or the other, $73,000,000; under the statutory powers of a bill passed the other day we are guaranteeing $28,000,000; under the statutory powers of this bill we are guaranteeing $15,000,000 or more, in all $116,000,000.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to find out from the Minister of Finance what objection there is to adopting the suggestion made to include these amounts in the Estimates. That seems to be very fair.

Mr. FIELDING: Because it has not been the practice in the past and I see no reason why we should depart from what has been practice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should not make that statement to the House. It has been the invariable practice in connection with the National Railways, and the minister does not do justice to the position he holds to lead anyone to suppose otherwise. With relation to the Canadian National Railways there has never been a dollar guaranteed—the minister cannot produce proof to the contrary; if he postponed the matter until next session he could not do so—that was not included in the amount voted by parliament for the purpose.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. FIELDING: What difference does it make as respects the obligation of the country whether we grant the money in the name of the Canadian National Railways or any other railway? The obligations of the country are the same with respect to a guarantee in either case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now we are getting it.

Mr. GOOD: Even if this has not been the custom, if it is a good thing why not adopt it?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think it is a good thing.

Mr. STEVENS: It has been the invariable custom.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not yet, certainly not.

Mr. CHURCH: Sub-section 3 of section 2 of the bill reads as follows:

> The said securities so approved may be guaranteed by His Majesty and any such guarantee may be in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine—

And so forth. We have no control over the policy and administration of the National Railways Company. Now, as a matter of fact the success of an issue of securities, more particularly in the case of a railway system of this kind, depends upon the manner and method of administration. We have heard it said often in the last year or two that we should give these railways a free hand. Is parliament to be debarred from any say as to these expenditures? It was not public ownership that got the railways into the condition where they show such large deficits, it was private ownership. What is going to become of responsible government in this country if we are to continue to spend money on these railways at the rate we are doing? Just think of it, a deficit of $73,000,000; $28,000,000 to be expended on branch lines, and $15,000,000 to be spent upon equipment, a total of $116,000,000. Compare that expenditure upon the railway system alone and then recall the fact that in 1896 the entire Dominion expenditure amounted to only $36,000,000. It is all very well to talk about giving the railways a free hand but no country in the world would confer upon a railway company such powers as we propose to grant without adequate parliamentary control. At the rate charges have been accumulating on these railways I do not know how matters are going to end. And yet some people talk of the necessity of giving the National Railways a free hand. Now, we have these deficits to which I have referred, and the expenditure of the railway system is piling up at a rapid

rate. It should be borne in mind that extravagance in operation is likely to seriously affect railway securities when they are placed upon the market. Is there ground for the assertion that extravagance has characterized the management of our railways? I think there is. For example, a sum of from $80,000 to $100,000 has been expended in fixing up a private car to enable the directors to travel all over Canada. I contend this is extravagance which should not exist, and it does not exist in the operation of railways under private management. I am friendly to public ownership, but I confess I am very much alarmed at the extravagance of the directors in conducting our national railways. Giving them a free hand, if carried to its logical conclusion, will bankrupt the national railways and, speaking metaphorically, drive them into the poor house. Look at the position in which the great railways in the United States find themselves. They are short of rolling stock, short of equipment in every respect, and their securities are not selling at nearly the former prices. Shaughnessy and Van Horne are said to have made a great success of railway administration in the United States a great many years ago, and afterwards they were identified with the Canadian Pacific Railway in this country. But not even the genius of a Shaughnessy or a Van Horne could have made of the Canadian Pacific the success it has been had it not been for the liberal "hand-out" given by this country. Of course there was also efficiency in operation. I doubt whether either of those railway magnates could make a success of the Canadian National Railways under the extravagant methods that now seem to prevail. The issue of bonds and securities by the Canadian National Railways should be made a matter of consideration and approval by the Railway Commission. What was the object of creating such a body if it was not to deal with matters of this kind. It is folly to talk about giving the management of our railways a free hand when there is such a lack of economy and efficient control. If parliament is going to give the management a free hand it will be a ruinous policy. We shall not, however, see any improvement until we return to the system of responsible government and parliamentary authority for expenditures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to take every step in my power to prevent this kind of legislation going through unguarded. I think the House as a whole now understands the attempts at concealment. There is only one thing in issue. It is not any question of the amount of the liability we are involved in, it is not a question of the powers we are granting, it is merely a question of whether we are going to depart from the custom we have observed from the commencement of the National Railways, of including the country's commitments in the Estimates. That is the whole question, and I do not think anybody can be honestly convinced to the contrary. When the same question was up before, in connection with new construction, the ministers had a better chance. They said, "Oh, this is for three years and we might not have enough in the Estimates to last just over the end of the fiscal year, and a contractor might have to stop," as if that would not apply to any other public work just the same. But they managed to confuse hon. members, and I have thought they must have had a good laugh in council, when they got through, over the way they did it. They cannot use that argument in this case, consequently they have been less successful. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Tolmie:

That there be added to subsection 3 of section 2 the following words:

Provided that before any guarantee is given the amount of same shall be included each year in the estimates and be voted by parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: The principle involved is scarcely worthy of a moment's consideration. The right hon. gentleman takes the ground that every appropriation and every obligation for the year undertaken by the government of Canada must be set forth in the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Mr. FIELDING: If the right hon. gentleman did not say that it is the substance of his argument. That is a departure from the practice of parliament. We do not set forth every obligation. There are many cases—I have already given illustrations, I can furnish many more—where appropriations are made by special act and are not set forth in the estimates. It makes no earthly difference whether they are voted in the estimates or are authorized by special act; the essence of the whole thing is that these obligations cannot be assumed without the vote of the House; and whether you have it on this page or that page, in this blue book or that blue book, what earthly difference does it make to the people of Canada? The obligations are assumed on parliamentary authority and are set forth and shown in the public accounts. There have been cases again and again—there always have been under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, there were such cases under our administration, and there will be in the future—when it is deemed right and

proper to provide for special appropriations in acts of parliament. You may lay down the rule that in every case the amount must be shown in the Estimates but I say it is a matter of no earthly importance to the parliament or the people of Canada so long as the rule is recognized of parliamentary control, and that no appropriation can be made unless it is made by this House. That is the essence of the whole thing. That is the principle for which we stand.

Amendment (Mr. Meighen) negatived: Yeas 37, Nays 67.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill 225, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

He said: The amendment consists in substituting the words "prima facie" for the word "conclusive." We provided in the bill that the report of the analyst would be taken as conclusive evidence, and the Senate substituted the words "prima facie" in lieu of conclusive, which I think is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a very small verbal change, but it might have a vast effect—something like leaving out the word "not." Changing the word "conclusive" to "prima facie" entails the necessity of having some one competent and authorized to determine what is conclusive.

Mr. BUREAU: It does not bar anyone from disputing the report of the analyst.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The matter can wait for committee.

Mr. BUREAU: I objected to the word "conclusive," but I decided to let it go to the House. I thought it would not be right to bar a man from bringing evidence to dispute the evidence of the officers of the department.

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

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Postmaster General), moved the second reading of Bill 246, to amend the Post Office Act.

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

[Mr. Fielding.]

On section 1—Postage rates on certain newspapers and periodicals reduced from 1½ cents to 1¼ cents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister might explain this section.

Mr. MURPHY: The explanation was given yesterday. Summarized it is a changing of the maximum postal rates on periodicals from 1½ to 1¼ cents per pound.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a lot more important than appears on the surface. The minister did give a fairly full explanation the other day. The rate was formerly very low entailing a tremendous loss to the country for the carriage of newspapers; and it is only fair that the House should know—which the minister did not say—that this loss necessarily was borne by the whole country, except the few who got the benefit of it. While it is true in a slight degree that the small newspapers get some benefit, the newspapers which get the real benefit are the great big newspapers that travel all over the Dominion, that go out of Montreal and Toronto and circulate from end to end of the country. The Dominion, as a matter of fact, was shouldering a heavy obligation in carrying newspapers, entailing, I cannot recall just how much, but running into hundreds of thousands—yes, running into millions of dollars; I am pretty sure I am right on that point, the minister should be able to tell us. So that it really amounted to a subsidy. The late government started to correct that state of affairs, and by a graduated scale we provided—and parliament accepted the provision—that the rate should go up to, I think, 1½ cents per pound. My recollection was, and the minister confirmed it yesterday, that even then we had not overtaken the loss by any means, and that it cost a great deal more to distribute than 1½ cents per pound.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not think I was out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I had reference to the conversation in the chamber.

Mr. MEIGHEN I appreciate the importance atached to my words by the Chair, because certainly all ought to hear them. This government has evidently submitted to importunities and proposes to go back, not all but part of the road, and leave the rate at 1¼ cents. I do not know what is involved in this 1¼ cents. The quarter of a cent difference amounts to a charge on the treasury of a very substantial sum, and the benefit goes,

not to the small papers—the amount that they are interested in, while of course it is something, is very little. The great benefit goes to the big newspapers. Let me emphasize this. The small newspaper is really hurt, I would think, by the low rate, for the reason that the field of the small newspaper is then more easily invaded by the large. The large newspaper gets into the small newspaper's field at the public expense, because of the cheap rate, and consequently curtails the circulation of the small newspaper. Is the minister not doing an injustice rather than a favour to the small newspapers? Ostensibly, perhaps, the small newspaper proprietor will think: "I would like to get my paper out as cheaply as I can, more cheaply than actual cost," but he will find his field more easily invaded by the big paper. According to the law, I understand the rate of postage is the same for a long distance as for a short. I am pretty sure I am right in that. Therefore a newspapr is carried from Montreal to Vancouver at the same rate as that for which the proprietor of a small newspaper gets his paper carried perhaps, a ride of eight miles. Thus, the more you go below the cost, the greater the advantage to the big newspaper in its competition with the smaller one, particularly in view of the statements that have reached the people through the press of the great economies the minister is effecting, all of which were due to the continuing of the ascending scale rate that we put into effect. I would not like to see the minister robbed of the benefit of that just as the time of fruition is arriving. I would like to see him get the benefit of the better showing which our legislation might bring forth. Why should he want to deny himself now? Would he not have been better to stand to his guns and be, at least, in a position to show the result of the legislation of others?

Mr. MURPHY: May I say, in brief, that the argument which my right hon. friend has just placed before the House from different standpoints, is incorrect from each standpoint? As regards what he said last, that the increase—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The better showing.

Mr. MURPHY: —the "better showing" was due to an act passed in 1920, that is not the fact. May I take the House into confidence for a moment, and say that when I came into office, I found that an order in council had been passed by the administration of which my right hon. friend was a member, taking away from the Postmaster General the right to make railway mail rates and vesting that power in the Board of Railway Commissioners? That was obviously done to make a better showing for the Canadian National railways, and it was of course acquiesced in by the other railways. I went to the trouble of taking a staff of officers to New York to investigate railway mail rates inasmuch as the order in council passed here was professedly based on American practice. After a week's intensive investigation in New York, I discovered, with the aid of my officials, that the Post Office Department was paying the railways of Canada as much to carry one mail bag in a baggage car, as the same railways charged to carry two passengers with their bags in a parlour car. Naturally, being a business man, I was not quite so innocent as to let that sort of thing continue. I had the order in council repealed and a new scale of railway mail rates adopted, as a result of which at one stroke we saved $400,000. In addition, I found that a considerable number of accounts for the carriage of mails of foreign countries across Canadian territory had not been attended to, nor had settlements been made. Settlements were negotiated, and eventually we succeeded in getting all those accounts settled, with the result that the treasury of the Dominion of Canada benefited to the extent of $950,000.

As a result of the International Postal Conference that was held last fall—and by the way it may surprise the committee to know that the work of that conference was concreted into a treaty which I signed, without any ambassador, British or American, intervening, acting solely under the powers conferred upon me as Canadian Postmaster General by the Canada Post Office Act—we saved at one stroke $110,000 which we formerly paid for the carriage of American mail across our territory from Buffalo to Detroit. Under the provisions of the treaty that we made last December the Americans agreed to relieve us of that payment. A further change that was made in consequence of the conference, was that we get from the United States payment on the excess parcels carried to Canada, an amount that will aggregate about $300,000 per annum. These are some of the new sources of revenue of the Post Office Department, without my going into the question of these rates at all.

As to the other argument of my right hon. friend that it is the small paper that is really affected, representations made to me are entirely contrary to that. The small papers are the papers that have pressed for this deduction. Only this morning I was informed by a gentleman engaged in the publication of a weekly newspaper, who is a very ardent supporter of my right hon. friend, that it is the

small papers that will be benefited, because they are the ones that are most affected.

The other argument that my right hon. friend used—that the daily papers would invade particularly the field of the local papers—is not a fact, because the big newspapers do not, as a matter of fact, use the post office for transmission within short distances. They send their papers by express. In the act, there is a section with which my right hon. friend was not familiar, which provides that papers issued not more than once a week are carried free of postage within an area of forty miles. I think that disposes of my right hon. friend's arguments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has taken occasion to review matters not connected at all with his bill—

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, arising out of the economies.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—matters which consequently would not be investigated by hon. members for the purpose of replying to him. I notice that the one large item which he mentioned, was an item of collection of debts. I would presume that such items would appear almost every year. There certainly would be debts to collect, and while, sometimes, it is an achievement to collect them, I would fancy that in these cases, it would be practically no achievement at all.

Mr. MURPHY: These were three years overdue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and if this government is in power for three years—and I doubt that—it will have debts which are overdue, too.

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some of them I can name now. As regards the savings in connection with his postal conference, I only hope they are correct.

Mr. MURPHY: They are correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not been able to go into them, and I only hope they are correct. There is no reason why there should not be improvement in this regard, nor in connection with the carriage of mails. I would not think it was a colossal achievement, warranting us in sending a wreath of flowers to the Postmaster General, that at a time when all rates are or ought to be going down, there should be some reduction in these rates. I understand from the minister the matter of railway mail rates was placed under the Railway Commission. I do not know myself why that should not be. That would seem to me to be the appropriate place.

Mr. MURPHY: That was done in violation of the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the commission would not have power.

Mr. MURPHY: They acted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know. I have not looked into the legal aspect of the matter at all, but it seems to me that the Railway Commission is the proper place in which to discuss the railway mail rates.

Mr. MURPHY: The Post Office Act empowers the Postmaster General to make all rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. I am not speaking now as a matter of law but as a matter of policy. I do not know why one thing after the other should be taken from the commission unless we are to abolish it. I would fancy it was the proper body. I would expect that when reducing newspaper rates mail rates would also be reduced. But why should this rate be reduced when it is below cost? The minister says the small publishers want the reduction. There may be some who do. My recollection is that the pressure did not come from them, but I do recall very strong pressure indeed from other sources. I am just as anxious to help large papers as any others, but there is a limit to the help that ought to be given out of the Treasury. The minister says that he was terribly shocked in New York to find that the railways were getting the same for carrying a mail bag as for carrying two persons with their baggage. Such anomalies can be found anywhere in transportation service. Right under this bill—if the minister gets it through— he is providing the same charge for carrying the Montreal Star from Montreal to Vancouver, 5,000 miles, as for carrying the Portage la Prairie Graphic out to Carberry, 45 miles. Is not this disparity infinitely greater than that of the case he mentions? These disparities inevitably occur in railway transportation, so there is really nothing remarkable about what he found in New York. I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of this bill. I should like the minister to produce figures so that the committee may understand just what amounts are involved. How much are we losing now on the carriage of mails? And what does this mean in the way of voting money out of the Treasury?

Mr. MURPHY: In reply to my right hon. friend's request made yesterday, the department informs me that newspapers are carried

as part of the general mails, and it is practically impossible to segregate the cost of their carriage. The difference in postal revenue under this reduction will amount to about $200,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The difference between the 1½ and the 1¼ cent rate?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not see why periodicals and newspapers should be given reduced rates unless the reduction is extended to other mail matter. The Postmaster General might well follow the example of his illustrious precedessor, Sir William Mulock, and reduce the postage rates to the pre-war level. There might be deficits at first but within a year or two the increased business would result in a surplus. There should be some way of separating the receipts of the postal department so as to show the revenue from postal business and from revenue stamps.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) is quite correct. I know that very complete statements were made up by the post office, and I would ask him to bring down the file showing the calculations made for the information of a sub-committee that went into this matter very carefully.

Mr. MURPHY: When?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At the time the order went through for increasing these rates. The increase was not jumped at. Does my hon. friend know what the cost in the States is for the carrying of newspapers?

Mr. MURPHY: I have not that statement at hand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely he knows the American rates?

Mr. MURPHY: What sub-committee does my hon. friend refer to?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was a sub-committee that reported on the cost of distributing this newspaper mail. There should be officials in his department capable of furnishing this information, unless he has got rid of everyone who knows anything. Dr. Coulter would certainly know, and also former Inspector Ross. Of course, these two gentlemen are no longer in the department. I ask my hon. friend to bring that report down, as well as information regarding the American newspaper rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Corresponding to these.

Mr. MURPHY: I have not any of the information for which my hon. friend asks. If he insists on its being furnished we will have to adjourn.

At one oclock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see that my genial friend the minister is here with the information that I was asking for.

Mr. MURPHY: Before the House rose at one o'clock the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) made reference to a sub-committee to consider the question of increased postal rates on newspapers in 1920. My hon. friend was unable to give me exact information as to the sub-committee in question, but I have found out since that it was a sub-committee of the cabinet and that the data was prepared for the information of that sub-committee. My hon. friend also mentioned that Dr. Coulter or Mr. Ross would be certain to have the information if they were available, but as they were not around he thought it might not be obtainable from the other officials in the department. As to that I may say that the data was prepared in 1920 by Mr. Webster, secretary of the department, and the same gentleman, Mr. Webster, handed me the data since one o'clock. I find that the United States rates, in regard to which my hon. friend as well as the hon. leader of the Opposition were inquiring, are 1½ cents a pound on the news section of newspapers, and from 2 to 10 cents a pound on the advertising sections, depending on the distance. That is, zones have been established varying from 150 miles to 1,800 miles and over.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That applies to the news sections as well as to the advertising.

Mr. MURPHY: Not to the reading matter. The rate applying to reading matter—that is, the news sections—is 1½ cents a pound.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rise not for the purpose of opposing the bill so much as for the purpose of showing why the rate was put in. The information the minister has been good enough to give me I also found upstairs. He did not tell me anything about costs, and I will give Mr. Webster's information on that question. The report reads:

> According to statistics taken in August, 1918, the total weight of newspapers carried by post is 87,501,490 pounds per annum. The sum collected for newspaper postage last year amounted to only $291,104. Newspapers now occupy 60 per cent of the floor space required for the transportation of the mails.

Just there I would ask the minister what proportion is now taken by the newspapers.

Mr. MURPHY: I think it would be about the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think so, too. The report continues:

As this is paid for by the car mile it means that for railway transportation alone papers cost the department over $2,000,000 per annum. This cost is for carriage alone and does not include a single cent for transfer to stations, transfer between trains and stations, sortation and distribution at the office of posting and on trains, mail courier service, handling and delivery at post office of destination, etc. The total expenditure for the carriage of mails and the cost of mail bags during the fiscal year 1918 was $8,293,-515.24. Sixty per cent of this amount, or $4,976,-109.15 might therefore be charged to newspaper service, in addition to a percentage of the salaries of postmasters and other post office employees, which it would be difficult to apportion.

In the last analysis the question is one of transportation. The department pays for the carriage of mails across the country by the car mile, and every car added means a very considerable amount added to the cost of transportation.

Then it is pointed out that newspapers are carried by post not only without profit but at an immense loss. What did the receipts from the carriage of newspapers amount to last year at the increased rate?

Mr. MURPHY: My information is, about $1,300,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So then if the figures of my hon. friend's clerk are correct we got $1,300,000 from a service that costs $4,900,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY: I would not admit that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am just taking the data my hon. friend has referred to—sixty per cent of this amount or $4,967,109.15 as the cost of giving this service. If my hon. friend has any other figure I would like to consider it now.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend will appreciate that between one o'clock and now there has not been much time to check the figures, but roughly speaking the amount is between two and three millions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole difference that my hon. friend gave in cost was a small item of $400,000 in connection with the railways.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend is confusing two things. That is what the railways charge the post office for carrying the mails.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not confusing them at all. One figure is $2,000,000 for railway transportation. There has been a saving in the whole transportation of $400,000. We have to take the same fraction in connection with the $4,000,000, which would give us $240,000, so in relation to a cost of $2,000,000 we would have a cost to-day of that sum less $240,000.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend will appreciate that even the amount stated was only an approximate amount.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But my hon. friend has nothing else, and this was prepared by a gentleman to whom he gave a good character just a few minutes ago. Now as to the volume of business, I wonder if this is right: Over two-thirds of the newspapers the post office carries are dailies, or about 65,000,000 copies per annum. Has my hon. friend information on that now?

Mr. MURPHY: I would suppose the proportion would be maintained.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The postage on the dailies at that time was $162,500. What is the present postage?

Mr. MURPHY: I have only the details mentioned. I think it is $1,300,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, as to the weeklies, there were only 20,000,000 pounds of weekly newspapers carried with a postage of $40,000. The net result would be that the rate at that time amounted to $200,000 roughly speaking, which has been increased to $1,300,000.

Mr. MURPHY: The quarter-cent rate prevailed at that time. It amounted to $290,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The memorandum goes on as follows:

No other country has as low a postage rate for newspapers as Canada. In fact, in every other country in the world, except Canada and the United States, postage on newspapers is prepaid by stamp affixed to each copy. In many cases the rates go from 3 to 7 cents per pound. The rate is really more than this when it is considered that it is not a bulk rate but that each paper must bear its own postage, so that advantage cannot be taken of fractions as is the case in Canada and the United States where the rates are on the bulk weight of the mailings.

I would ask my hon. friend if that same condition applies to-day.

Mr. MURPHY: I would expect it would, but I have not definite information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the memorandum says:

In the United States the present newspaper rates are 1½ cents per pound on the reading matter and on advertisements contained in the papers from 1½ to 5½ cents according to the distance the papers have to

be carried, the rates on the advertising portions of the papers being settled according to the distance the papers have to be carried, and these latter rates are to be increased from a minimum of 2 cents to a maximum of 10 cents per pound, according to the distance, and becoming effective in July, 1921.

I would ask if the American government has put that increase into effect.

Mr. MURPHY: I am so informed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So, although the American rates were higher than ours they have been increased to a still greater sum.

Mr. MURPHY: I think the rates mentioned by my hon. friend are the rates in force at the present time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would be an increase from a minimum of two cents to a maximum of ten cents a pound according to the distance. In Great Britain the rate is a flat one of one cent per copy, which means a rate of at least three or four cents per pound on the bulk weight. Is that correct to-day?

Mr. MURPHY: I have no information as to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Again, am I right in this, that there was practically no increase made in so far as the rural weekly newspapers throughout the country are concerned, as a large part of their circulation is carried postage free. Does my hon. friend propose to disturb those conditions?

Mr. MURPHY: There was an exception made for papers published not more than once a week. The weeklies were carried free within a radius of forty miles.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right. could my hon. friend give me any other reasons for the adoption of the act other than those already given?

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know that I can add anything to the reasons already given. The representations made have been made, as I explained to the committee, at the instance largely of the smaller newspapers, the weekly papers, religious papers, technical papers, trade papers and other publications of that character.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It will be noticed from the figures supplied by the department itself, then, that it is the small end that is interested. The large end, the eighty per cent, are not interested in it at all. It used to be otherwise in days gone by. The big people, the eighty per cent, were the interested people and they thought they were paying a great deal too much and that we were doing a great deal for the small people in leaving them as they were left. What I am doing now is merely showing justification for the action taken by the former government. I am not now going to oppose what my hon. friend is doing. I know it is no good, but I think we have to show a complete justification for our course, Mr. Chairman, when on the admitted figures the revenues then obtained were $290,000 and the cost of carrying the service was over $4,900,000. The revenue to-day is bettered being $1,300,000 as stated by my hon. friend, but the cost apparently remains constant with the exception of sixty per cent of $400,000, or $240,000. Of course, my hon. friend does not dispute the original figures. What is my hon. friend's estimate as to the reduction in revenue when this change is made?

Mr. MURPHY: The estimated reduction will be about $200,000 on the $1,300,000. I would draw attention to the fact that the special committee of the cabinet, of which my hon. friend was a member, had before it all this data and with that data before it it decided not to impose a higher maximum rate, than 1½ cents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that my hon. friend agrees that we went far enough.

Mr. MURPHY: It has been claimed you went too far.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend evidently thinks we went far enough. Although the deficits were great we did not take it all up, I admit that. Has my hon. friend any figures in connection with the supplementary estimates that are brought down?

Mr. MURPHY: The Post Office has complied strictly with the request of the Minister of Finance to practise economy and has brought down no supplementary estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very glad to hear that, and yet I am sorry, because I wanted to discuss a matter with the minister. I was going to ask him when the orders and the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission are going to be given effect to in his department.

Mr. MURPHY: The orders and recommendations of the Civil Service Commission have been given effect to as rapidly as possible, and if there are any still remaining for attention they will receive my attention as soon as the House prorogues.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very glad to have that assurance from my hon. friend, because it has seemed to be years before we could get any action out of the department.

The weather is warm and molasses ought to move freely now but in this case the molasses seems to be frozen all the time. There are appointments dating back for many months. If the minister looks into the matter he will find there was a list given to the House, but the Acting Postmaster General could not do anything about it in the absence of the head of the department. I do hope that something will be done now. I merely want to point out to my hon. friend that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the period of time allowed in connection with temporary appointees is long since passed and that the payments made to them are entirely illegal.

Mr. FORKE: I almost hesitate to intervene in the dialogue between the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) and the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), but I should like to say a word in connection with the rate on newspapers. I do not think the rate affects dailies as much as some would suppose, but it is a matter of concern to quite a few very important weekly newspapers that circulate all over the Dominion. I must say that it benefits our people to a very large extent to be furnished with these papers at a reasonable rate. In the case of these weeklies I should think the increase in the rate per pound would affect them very seriously. For that reason I should almost be inclined to reduce the rate to one cent instead of one and a quarter cents. However, since the ex-Minister of Finance is pleased with it I think we might, perhaps, let the proposed rate go through.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not express any such opinion.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know whether this is the proper time to register a protest against the increasing size of the newspapers of to-day. I think they are becoming almost a nuisance on that account. It may be deemed presumptuous on my part to indulge in anything like criticism along this line, but it does seem pertinent when we hear the talk about the increasing cost of paper and other expenses in connection with the production of newspapers. I suppose the increased size of our daily journals is to be attributed to the volume of advertising. I sometimes pick up a newspaper and notice that it is entirely blank except for some such announcement as this: "This space is reserved. Watch out for to-morrow." I think that in the matter of size our newspapers are almost getting beyond the limit, and if this policy continues I should almost be inclined to add a little more to the postage rate.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

There is another thing to which I desire to refer. I do not want to waste time but I should like to take this opportunity of making this statement. I hope I am not lacking in a sense of humour, but I do not always like the funny page in our newspapers. I do protest against pages that are supposed to be funny but in reality are not so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do not cut out "Mutt and Jeff."

Mr. FORKE: Of course, other people may view this matter in a different light. I am pleased to see this reduction in the rate on newspapers. I think it will be of advantage to people living in rural communities. Living in this city, as I have been for the past five months, I appreciate the privilege city people have of getting the newspaper handed in to them at their door every morning, and I am prepared to encourage as much as possible anything that will promote the circulation of newspapers in the rural districts.

Mr. HANSON: I should like to ask the minister a question but first I will say for the benefit of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) that probably the managers of some of the large newspapers in this country had better send for him so that he may tell them how to run their journals.

Mr. FORKE: Thank you, you are very kind.

Mr. HANSON: It reminds me of the statement made by some hon. gentlemen to my left that a great many people are telling the farmers how to farm. In this case the hon. member for Brandon is telling the newspapers how to conduct their business.

Mr. FORKE: Excuse me. I did not speak about the production of newspapers, I spoke from the viewpoint of the reader.

Mr. HANSON: It did not strike me that way. The Postmaster General was good enough to say to the ex-Minister of Finance that immediately after prorogation he would attend to cases where certificates of appointment have been given postmasters, and other officials of the department, by the Civil Service Commission, but had not been acted on. During the Postmaster General's absence we had a short discussion here on the appointment of a postmaster at Clementsport, Nova Scotia. I beg to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the gentleman designated by—

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that such a matter

can hardly come up in connection with the postage rate on newspapers.

Mr. HANSON: If you will allow me to continue my statement I will not occupy a minute. In the case of the Clementsport post office a certificate was granted in May, 1922, but the gentleman has not yet been installed in office.

Mr. MURPHY: I shall look into the matter immediately.

Mr. RINFRET: As a newspaper man I may be permitted to say a word on this subject. I have much sympathy with the view expressed, that in course of time the newspapers should defray the full cost of transportation through the mails. The reduction in this instance is an indirect subsidy granted to newspapers . At the present time there is a subsidy given to the Canadian Press. It is true that only applies to a limited number of newspapers, but nevertheless it is for the dissemination of news. In the present case one might almost say that the reduced rate is for the dissemination of advertisements. In this country, however, the material used by the newspapers is still rather cheap as compared with the cost in European countries. That, perhaps, accounts for the amount of space devoted to the publication of advertisements as well as to the publication of news. The time may come when the government will have to follow the example of the United States and in their postal rate have regard to the amount of advertising as well as to the amount of news published by the newspapers. But this point does not arise in connection with the present legislation. We agreed on the principle three years ago, when a discussion took place on this matter. I believe that Hon. Mr. Burrell introduced a bill dealing with the postage rates on newspapers, and there was a general agreement that a time would come when the newspapers could not be allowed to send advertising through the mails at the cost of the taxpayer. A certain graduated scale of rates was then decided upon. Three years ago the rate was only ¼ cent per pound, but it was afterwards raised to 1½ cents a pound, or six times the former rate. The only object of the bill is to relieve the newspapers to some extent of this too rapid scale of increase, and give them a chance to readjust their operations according to the new condition of things. I think it is very reasonable that we should give them that privilege. After the provisions of the bill are put in force the newspapers will have to pay five times as much for transportation as they did three years ago. I think that is a very rapid advancement. Although I support the bill, as a newspaper man I stand very strongly for the newspapers paying the full cost of transportation for the papers sent to their customers throughout the country. It will either come to a point where they will have to charge more for subscriptions, or reduce the number of pages, but, in either case, it would be unfair to expect that the taxpayers would be expected forever to pay these rates for the transportation of newspapers.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported read the third time and passed.

PENSION LEGISLATION—PETITION PRESENTED

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): I ask the House to receive a petition which has been sent to me for presentation to the House. I understand that, under the rules, petitions should be presented prior to the introduction of bills, but in view of the fact the House will close shortly I ask the indulgence of hon. members to have the petition read by the Clerk at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the House, the hon. member may present the petition. Petitions are presented on routine proceedings, but by unanimous consent the petition can be presented now.

The petition was read, as follows:

To the Honourable the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled

The petition of the Dominion Veterans' Alliance of Canada

Humbly Sheweth:—

That John Thompson, Chairman, John Paton, Secretary, Board of Pension Commissioners, and N. F. Parkinson, Deputy Minister, E. Flexman, Director of Administration, W. C. Arnold, Director of Medical Services, Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, be instructed to refrain from further expression of opposition to the enactment of legislation approved by the House of Commons upon the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-establishment; and that said officials be cautioned to exercise greater sympathy toward disabled ex-service men and dependents of deceased ex-service men; and that assurance as to the intentions of the Honourable Members of the House of Commons in this regard be conveyed to the various organizations of ex-service men, who unanimously support this Petition.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House may be pleased to pass a resolution for the purposes above mentioned.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Dated at Ottawa this Twenty-eight day of June, A.D. 1923.

C. G. MacNeil,
Dominion Secretary-Treasurer,
The Great War Veterans' Association of Canada,
and Chairman of the Legislative Committee of
The Dominion Veterans' Alliance.

H. COLEBOURNE,
Dominion Secretary-Treasurer,
The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada, and Member of the Legislative Committee of The Dominion Veterans' Alliance.

J. S. KEELING,
Dominion Secretary-Treasurer,
The Tuberculous Veterans' Association, and Member of the Legislative Committee of The Dominion Veterans' Alliance.

J. MACKENZIE,
Representing the Imperial Veterans in Canada, and Member of the Legislative Committee of The Dominion Veterans' Alliance.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1923-4

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates for the year ending 31st March, 1924, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) read by Mr. Speaker to the House and referred to the committee of supply.

Mr. FIELDING: May I be permitted to ask that, to avoid delay, these supplementary estimates include two items, one of $30,000 for the administration of the Combines Act, and one for $10,000 a grant to the Canadian National Institute for the blind. These are two items omitted which should have been included.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil) (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 45, an Act respecting Chinese Immigration.

He said: I do not wish to concur in all the amendments without discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The usual move is for the House to receive the senate amendments and deal with them in the regular procedure, but a part of that procedure is a full explanation to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member might explain the nature of the amendments, and then the question could be put.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The senate has amended paragraph n of section 8. That paragraph reads:

(n) Persons over fifteen years of age, physically capable of reading, who cannot read the English or the French language or some other language or dialect. For the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read, the immigration officer shall use slips of uniform size prepared by direction of the minister, each containing not less than thirty and not more than forty words in ordinary use printed in plainly legible type in the language or dialect the person may designate as the one in which he desires the examination to be made, and he shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to Canadian citizens, or to persons in transit through Canada;

They have struck out the words—

The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to Canadian citizens or to persons in transit through Canada;

And they have substituted:

The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to persons residing in Canada at the date of the passing of this act, nor to Canadian citizens.

I may say for the information of the House that evidently the intent of the Senate was that it should not apply to Chinese now resident in Canada. I have no serious objection to offer to this, because in cases where the question of deportation of Chinese nationals who are in Canada might come up, we would not be likely to utilize this method of deporting.

Then clause 10 reads:

10. (1) The controller shall have authority to determine whether an immigrant, passenger or other person seeking to enter or land in Canada or detained for any cause under this Act is of Chinese origin or descent and whether such immigrant, passenger or other person, if found to be of Chinese origin or descent, shall be allowed to enter, land or remain in Canada or shall be rejected and deported.

(2) The examination of persons of Chinese origin or descent applying for admission or entry to Canada shall be separate and apart from the public and in the presence of such persons only as the controller shall permit.

They have added to that this clause:

Provided that if, on the preliminary hearing, the controller is not satisfied that such person is entitled to remain in Canada, the hearing shall be thereupon adjourned for forty-eight hours or for such longer period as the controller may see fit, and an opportunity shall be given such person to consult with duly accredited legal counsel who shall be entitled to represent him upon the hearing and upon all subsequent proceedings.

What it means is that when a decision that involves deportation is arrived at by the controller, a further hearing is guaranteed the applicant after the period of forty eight hours to permit him to secure counsel. I do not know that one should object to that particularly.

An amendment is made by the Senate to clause 18. The clause reads:

Within 12 months after the coming into force of this act and subject to such regulations as may be made by the Governor General in Council for the purpose, every person of Chinese origin or descent in Canada, irrespective of allegiance or citizenship, shall register with such officer or officers and at such place

or places as are designated by the Governor General in Council for that purpose, and obtain a certificate in the form prescribed.

The amendment is to insert the following:

Provided that those persons who may, during the time fixed for registration, be absent from Canada with authority to return, may register upon their return.

It will be somewhat embarrassing to registration officials to work this out, because it will have to be done at a designated time and over a designated period. If a resident of Canada is absent on permit and does not return within the specified time when the registration is going on, this is evidently for the purpose of allowing him to become registered or to make application for registration.

Mr. CARROLL: Does not the bill as introduced by the minister provide that when an oriental leaves this country and goes to his home, he may not return?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. He gets a permit upon which he may be absent for a specified time, and upon his return he presents that certificate.

Clause 26 has been amended. When the bill was in committee, one important amendment to clause 26 was submitted by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). The clause as passed by this House reads:

Whenever any officer or peace officer has reason to believe that any person of Chinese origin or descent has entered or remains in Canada—

The amendment of my hon. friend added to the officers who would have authority to demand the production of a certificate or to make an explanation of any who were thought to be in Canada illegally. Instead of this being confined to officers of the department, peace officers of the government were included. The Senate amendment is to strike out the words "or peace officer."

Mr. STEVENS: Does the minister approve that? If he does, I should like to say a word in regard to it, but if not,—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I can say is that under the legislation I have authority, without reference to this section, to appoint anyone a peace officer. Therefore the amendment is not so important from that standpoint.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the minister mean to infer that under paragraph (d) of clause 2, the interpretation clause, he can appoint any peace officer as an officer of the department, giving him the same powers as would be conferred should this which has now been struck out remain in the bill?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is my understanding.

Mr. NEILL: Presumably the Senate were animated by some reason or motive. Did they hint at or give any explanation of what that reason was?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think representations were made to the Senate by people acting on behalf of the Chinese that this was rather drastic, and they thought, perhaps, it was too drastic to include the whole police force in this particular work. As I pointed out to my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), there may be some virtue in making selections of various persons throughout the country to do this particular work.

Further down, the same clause 26 reads:

The officer may detain such person in custody and bring him before the nearest controller for examination, and if the controller finds that he has entered or remains in Canada contrary to the provisions of this act or the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereof, such person shall be deported.

The Senate have substituted the word "may" for the word "shall." We had some discussion upon the meaning of that particular word when we were discussing the bill in committee, but I do not believe this amendment makes much difference. It is in the discretion of the minister or the controller how he shall act in that particular case.

Clause 27 of the bill is struck out entirely and a new clause substituted. The new clause reads:

27. (1) Every person of Chinese origin or descent resident in Canada at the date of the coming into force of this act, who was admitted under the provisions of any act now or heretofore in force, and did not secure such admission by fraudulent misrepresentation, and does not belong to any of the prohibited classes of persons described in section 8 of this act, shall be deemed to be entitled to continue to reside in Canada: Provided, however, that any such person who was, subsequent to the 25th day of July, 1917, admitted without payment of the head tax because of his being a merchant and who has ceased to belong to such class, shall pay into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada the sum of five hundred dollars, and if he refuses or fails to make such payment he shall ipso facto forfeit his right to remain in Canada, and may be arrested by any officer without a warrant and brought before a controller for examination, whereupon he shall be dealt with to all intents and purposes in the same manner and subject to the same provisions as in the case of a person apprehended under section 26 of this act.

(2) Any person admitted under this act who at any time after admission ceases to belong to any of the classes admissible under this Act shall, unless he is a Canadian citizen, ipso facto forfeit his right to remain in Canada and may be arrested by any officer without a warrant and brought before a controller for examination, whereupon he shall be dealt with to all intents and purposes in the same manner and subject to the same provisions as in the case of a person apprehended under section 26 of this act.

It was not the intention of the department to do anything more than is contained in this amendment. That is, it was not the intention of the department to disturb any Chinese national who was in Canada legally at the time of the registration, because this refers to the registration. The intention

4 p.m.

was to deal only with those who were illegally in Canada at that time. It is alleged that in 1920 a very considerable number including many labourers, came in under a section permitting merchants to enter Canada. This amendment makes it a little difficult to deal with a labourer who came in two years ago as a merchant, but has been engaged in manual labour since, as it gives him the choice of paying the $500 head tax or being deported. In dealing with the nationals of any country who are admitted by making false representations, we have not very much leeway. The natural course would be to deport them. Probably not more than thirteen or fourteen hundred persons would be affected by this amendment.

Mr. CARROLL: Who would be the judge of whether a man is a merchant or a labourer?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is alleged that a number of these men never were merchants, and came in by misrepresentation. However, Mr. Speaker, rather than lose the effect of the balance of the legislation which we think it is in the interests of the department to have, I move that we accept the Senate amendment.

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

FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on bill No. 238 to amend the Feeding Stuffs Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Definition. Bran, pure shorts, etc.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Has the minister any explanation to give the committee regarding the proposed changes in the bill?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The committee will recall that this matter was pretty fully discussed under the resolution, which was changed to a certain extent. Since then the millers' representatives have discussed the bill with some of the members of the Advisory Board under the Seed Control Act, who informed me that the agreement arrived at between the millers, the live stock men and the produce dealers is, in their estimation, the fairest arrangement that can be devised. I pointed out to them that this House has the last word in respect to these matters, and that the consensus of opinion seemed to be in favour of keeping each mill by-product distinct. The millers' representatives pointed out that if this were done the millers would once more have to change their appliances, having already changed them to comply with the recommendations of the Advisory Board in such a way as to have four of the by-products pure, with a fifth consisting of a mixture of screenings and shorts. I have looked into the matter pretty carefully and I think that if we get four by-products of the mill in their purity it will be in the interests of buyers to allow a mixed feed of screenings and shorts, for which there must be a demand or the mills would not make it. Primarily the demand for this mixture must come from those who use it, mostly farmers. Naturally the millers want to meet that demand.

Mr. HALBERT: Has the department full knowledge that the millers could not buy screenings at Fort William for shipment to their mills, there to be ground and mixed with shorts?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is quite right, the millers could do so. But as far as I can make out screenings are not sufficiently popular down here for the millers to do so.

Mr. BROWN: Is the minister satisfied that the demand by farmers for mixed feed is sufficient to justify the mixture?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What else would induce the millers to manufacture it? I am trying to be fair to all sides. As far as I understand the situation, while the millers may defeat the purpose of the bill, it seems to me it is in their interests not to do so, because they must please their customers with this mixture. They have four by-products in their purity—bran, shorts, middlings and low grade flour, and it is at the option of the buyer to ask for a mixture of screenings and shorts. Really, in our own interests as farmers I do not think we should be so exacting in our determination to have all these by-products in such an absolute condition of purity. You cannot get the best-balanced ration of fodder without a mixture. I am not a miller, but I am placing the arguments of the millers before hon. members. They take this ground: If you do not permit us to mix anything with the screenings to make them more acceptable to the buyer, we have to lose money by selling the screenings unmixed. I understand that they are quite unpopular down here.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Hear, hear.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not because they are bad feed.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Yes, there is nothing else in it but screenings.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The term "mill screenings" suggests refuse, more or less. I have bought mill screenings at the Saskatoon elevator that were as good a hog feed as I ever fed. I do not understand the prejudice against it down here, but it does seem to exist. If they have to dispose of these screenings without being permitted to mix them with anything to make them more acceptable, there will have to be a loss and I suppose they will have to make it up on something else. I do not know whether there is anything in that or not, but I am placing the matter before the committee. We want to do what is in the interests of both parties concerned, the mills and the buyers of mill products.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): I understand that when the wheat is bought by the miller it is bought with a certain dockage; the screenings are the result of the dockage and cost the miller practically nothing. It should be insisted upon that an analysis of these different foods be set out on the label attached to each sack. I have in mind the situation that existed during the war where the millers in Ontario reground bran and sold it to the farmers as shorts. Had an analysis of that material been furnished, it would clearly have been shown to be bran, but as it was, the persons who bought it were deceived; they not only paid a higher price but they paid for something they did not really get. There has been a lot of deception in the case of mill feeds and I think we should provide every possible safeguard. I am against anything being done to allow the millers to mix feeds unless they will state on the tags exactly what the analysis of the mixture is. That is a necessary safeguard to the buyers of the product.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is fair enough. The bill provides exactly for that.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): Not the analysis.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, the analysis is here; the exact fibre content is shown. If the bran is ground into shorts, that will be known, because the fibre content will be stated.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): It will not state the amount of protein, carbohydrates and fat.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, you will have to go into that further. But the fibre content is an indication of whether the material is bran or shorts or whether one has been converted into the other. As to the cost, my experience has been that wheat stored in the terminals, from which the millers usually buy, is purchased out of the terminals and paid for on its gross weight. When it is inspected at Winnipeg the inspection certificate will state not only the grade but also the dockage, if any. When it is sent to Fort William the inspectors must see that when it is unloaded it is put into its proper grade, and the proper amount of cleaning is done to make it come up to the inspection certificate. When that is done and it is warehoused it is bought as wheat and paid for as wheat. That is my understanding of it, and I have reasonable knowledge of the conditions. What other system could you have? When that wheat goes into the Fort William or any other terminal elevator and is commercially cleaned, it still contains so much screenings that it cannot be ground out that way. You have to go further than having it commercially cleaned; as a miller you have to clean it yourself and take out certain commodities in the way of refuse. It is permissible for this stuff to go into the general bin and even to go over for export, but it has to be taken out by whatever miller uses the wheat. Yet it is paid for as wheat. Well, what are you going to do with it? It is really a mill by-product; it is what was grown by and bought from the farmers. The contention is that if a mixture is produced of these screenings and shorts and they are labelled accordingly, there will be no deception.

What I want to get at is the best possible way of dealing with this question that has been on the boards now for quite a while. I am afraid that the milling industry ran a little loose some years ago in the unauthorized mixing of screenings. Legislation was later brought in under which they were authorized to do general mixing, and you could hardly get a better brand of shorts which has none of these mill screenings in it. There is still the suggestion that a compounding of mill screenings and shorts be permitted. If the committee do not want that; if they think it is not in the interests of anybody, particularly of the buyer, let us have it out, but let us not, out of prejudice to the mill, hurt those who have to buy this product. I assume that the reason why the mills want to make it that way is because somebody wants to buy it that way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: But the buyers cannot get anything else. They have to take the adulterated stuff; they have no option in the matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, they have the option.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is not available; the mills do not manufacture it.

Mr. BROWN: The minister laid emphasis on the fact that the millers buy wheat and pay for it as wheat, notwithstanding the fact that there is a certain proportion of screenings in it. That is true, of course, in regard to the wheat actually going through the terminals at Fort William. But how about the mills situated all through western Canada which buy wheat from the threshing machines, which buy large quantities of screenings that they do not pay for? In that case they get the stuff absolutely free. I saw something in one of the mills last fall that made me feel pretty strongly on this point. I saw not only screenings, but scourings, dirt, sweepings, going into the shorts, and when I remembered that that shorts was on occasions used for human food, I felt disgusted. It is unfortunate that we should have to make regulations governing the mills in the interests of the consumer, but I do not see how we can do anything else. These mills are equipped with the very best machinery to take out every grain of wild oats, every one of the smallest seeds. The wheat is ground absolutely pure, so that the flour is pure, the bran and shorts are pure. Now, are we to allow them to go back and mix in all kinds of rubbish? It may be said that the miller should be allowed to do what he pleases with his own product. But this stuff is palmed off on a helpless public, who, in the great majority of cases have no opportunity of knowing what they are buying, who are compelled to buy this stuff because they cannot get a pure product. I do not think we should countenance any other law than that these products should be kept absolutely pure. I am aware that many of our western screenings have good feeding value, such as wild oats, wild buckwheat, and that some of the screenings are made up of cracked and broken wheat, which has a large feed value. But there are years when our western crops contain large quantities of seeds that are of little or no value compared with these. Very often we have large quantities of pigweed seed, French weed, mustard and other weeds. These things are all ground up and put into the bran and shorts, and sometimes the bran and shorts are left in such a way that they are so unpalatable to the stock that they will not take them, and the man who has bought them has no redress. The minister knows this as well as the rest of us from the West. We do not need to convince him personally that the interests of the public are jeopardized so long as this mixing of screenings with good wholesome bran and shorts goes on. If it continues to go on, probably pure bran and shorts will be on the market in such limited quantities that it will not be possible for us to get them at all.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Does the minister know that the millers in the province of Ontario mix with the bran and shorts the dust and dust screenings from oatmeal? I know that hundreds of tons of these dust screenings are mixed in with other feed in the province of Ontario. I am strongly opposed to anything being mixed with these screenings.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are two sides to the question. There have been abuses with regard to mixing feeds in the past, and the point is, shall we go from the one extreme of allowing indiscriminate mixing to the other extreme of not allowing any mixing at all? That is the alternative. Is there not a middle course of having a mixture for the buyer who wants to buy mixed feed? If there is I would suggest to every member of the committee that, after we are through discussing it, we have a vote regardless of where we are sitting, just on the merits of the question, and see if we cannot come to a decision. If we do that nobody can have any grievance; I am sure I will not have. I think that is the best course to take in regard to the matter because it seems to me unwise to rush from the one extreme of indiscriminate mixing to the other extreme of not allowing any mixing at all. I have indicated to the millers' representatives that if one mixture is allowed, that is the mixture of screenings and shorts, and they do not play fair with it in the next year, I shall be one of the very first to cut this mixing down to a minimum. We are giving them that advantage not in their interests alone but in the interests of the buyers of these feeds.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I suggest to the minister that the mixing can always be done, and it is done to a large extent to-day, by the producer of the stock. If I want a mixed feed I can buy the feeds and mix them myself. I much prefer mixing my own feeds to having them mixed by someone I do not know anything about.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is not often done.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It will be done.

Mr. CALDWELL: I was not in when this discussion started and I am surprised at the trend of it now because I thought this matter was all settled on June 22 when the bill was up for second reading. On that occasion the minister moved an amendment which was agreed to by the House, and which will be found on page 4425 of Hansard, in which he proposed to cut out the word "pure" and the words "shorts and screenings."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am sympathetically that way yet.

Mr. CALDWELL: But now he talks of taking a vote. I had supposed that all we had to do was give this bill its third reading. There was no objection to this amendment when it was moved by the minister on the 22nd and I hope that he is not going to go back on the stand he took then, which I think was a very good one. I think he was absolutely right, and I hope he will stand by his bill as he amended it the other evening.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One of the reasons the bill is before my hon. friend in the form it is, is that it was reprinted in accordance with the amended resolution, but unfortunately one page of it was left exactly the way it was, while the other was according to the resolution. We had to take something, so we took the original bill.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister seems to have very bad luck in having his bills printed. Perhaps we should get a special proof-reader for his bills. But the minister's explanation is no excuse for going back on the amendment that was adopted the other evening, and I would suggest to him that if we do not make the corrections in committee here now, he had better withdraw the bill and have it reprinted.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister suggests that we take a vote. We cannot take a vote in committee unless there is a motion made to amend the bill or on a motion that the committee rise or a clause be passed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not yet reached the stage of making a motion.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister permit the committee to discuss the motion before we vote on it? If he is going to have a motion let us have it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was not going to move one. I am willing to take the bill the way it is, as a compromise.

Mr. KAY: Perhaps the committee will allow me to make a few remarks on this question. As chairman of the committee on Agriculture and Colonization, I was present as a member of the advisory council which met here in the winter. On that council were representatives of the feeders, the breeders, the millers—

Mr. BLACK (Huron): What were their names?

Mr. KAY: I have not a list of the names here.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): We would like to have them.

Mr. KAY: The department would have the list.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Who appointed this committee?

Mr. KAY: It was appointed, I think, by the department or by the Seed branch.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I forget the names of the members. They were from western Ontario. I think one of them was Mr. Brethour. Two of the millers were Mr. Cornell and Mr. G. B. Watts, of Toronto. There were twelve or fifteen representatives altogether, and I had met only two or three of them before. All interests were represented on that council. My hon. friend should not shake his head. It is a regular thing to have advisory boards of this character. There are advisory boards in connection with half of the acts we pass. He must not be disappointed if I cannot remember all the names.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it not on the recommendation of the minister that this board is appointed? He names the members of the board.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, the live stock associations select their own representatives, the produce men and the millers theirs. The department has one or two representatives on the board including Mr. Clark of the Seed branch, but the others are appointed by the different interests.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Section 14 of the act clearly provides that the minister shall have power to appoint an advisory board who will at his request prepare and recommend to him such regulations as appear to them advisable to make under this act. This is the authority of the minister to appoint this advisory council.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will do the formal appointing, I have no doubt, on the recommendations given to us by these respective bodies.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In view of the fact that there are seven pages of regulations in connection with the act made on the recommendations of this board, I think it is proper that the committee should know the status of this board and the names of those who were present considering this matter.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Who were the live stock men?

Mr. KAY: I remember that Mr. Stonehouse was there, representing the Eastern Dairymens' Association; Mr. Brethour representing the Swine Breeders' Association, and two or three other members representing live stock associations. I was appointed to represent the committee on Agriculture on that board. Dr. Grisdale was also there, Dr. Shutt, Mr. Archibald, Mr. White, all of the Department of Agriculture; and Mr. Clark, the Seed Commissioner, was the chairman. After three days' discussion on the various matters relating to live stock industry, on feeds and other questions of interest to the breeders, a day was spent in discussing bran, shorts, and middlings. This bill practically represents the conclusions which were arrived at at that meeting. The live stock men there felt that it was most desirable that all the mill feeds—bran, shorts, middlings and feeding flour—should be absolutely pure. That is the aim which all the live stock men hope to attain ultimately. But during the conference the point of view of the millers was advanced. And we came to the conclusion that under the present conditions—so long as the farmers will grow weeds and produce weed seeds and screenings, and in view of the fact that the millers buy these screenings and must dispose of them after having bought them—the best interests of the live stock men would be served by having bran, middlings, and feed flour always pure, but allowing the screening, to a certain extent, to be mixed with the shorts. Feeders will remember that for many years screenings have been mixed with shorts, bran and feed flour, and it was with the object of having the screenings in one place and one place only that this agreement was arrived at

The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) asked the minister, if the mills could buy screenings as such by the car load, and bring them in and mix them up with their shorts. I understand that Mr. Clark, of the Seed branch, and the department know or can ascertain where every car load of screenings goes which leaves Fort William. Now, it is no doubt true that the mills who buy from the interior elevators buy their wheat subject to dockage—

Mr. HALBERT: You say the department know where every load of screenings goes? Knowing that why can they not prohibit the millers from grinding screenings and mixing them with shorts?

Mr. KAY: The department are enabled to ascertain whether the millers are doing this or not. If the millers buy any quantities of screenings separately from the wheat, the officials of the department know that and steps can be taken to prevent their buying screenings in order to mix them with shorts. As far as the wheat bought from the elevators at Fort William is concerned I understand it contains a certain percentage of weed seeds or screenings up to about three per cent. Those screenings the millers pay for as wheat and wish to incorporate in the shorts. Now if there is not more than three per cent of screenings from the wheat which the millers buy and that is mixed with the shorts, I do not think the farmers will suffer to any great extent, because it was brought out at that meeting by many of the breeders that they desired to buy screenings as they were valuable for food. The chemical analysis given by Dr. Shutt of the value of screenings is very high, showing that they are worth more as a feed than shorts. Farmers well know that you cannot use screenings, however, for feeding young animals. If young pigs, for example, are fed with screenings to any extent it will cause indigestion and very often death.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): I have seen screenings mixed with shorts and hogs refused to eat it. Other farmers have seen the same thing happen.

Mr. KAY: Of course, screenings should not be fed to young pigs or young calves, but they appear to be an excellent food for mature stock.

Mr. HALBERT: You say the department knows where every car load of screenings goes. Now, suppose the department finds that a miller is buying screenings and mixing them with shorts, is there no way of penalizing the miller for doing so? What procedure does the department take in such a case?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the past it has been legal for them to do so.

Mr. HALBERT: But will it be under the bill as now proposed?

Mr. KAY: I do not think there is anything in this bill to prevent it. But the minister says that if the millers are found to be buying screenings and mixing them up with their feeds he will bring down legislation to prevent it another year. I do not think the millers could do that to any great extent without being found out.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): Do you think the millers would undergo any hardship in being compelled to grind screenings separately and selling them for what they are? My impression is that if you allow this privilege to the millers of mixing feeds we are going to have feeds foisted on the purchaser that are not of the character he thinks they are. I think there can be no hardship, none at any rate that I can see, in saying to the miller "You grind your shorts separately and sell it as shorts, grind your screenings and shorts separately." The purchaser can mix them if he wants to.

Mr. KAY: To hark back to this advisory council. I am quite frank in saying that my own desire, and the desire of the breeders and the department officials who were present at the conference, was to have all the mill offal from wheat absolutely pure. I make no bones about that. I look forward to the day when that will be brought about.

An hon. MEMBER: Why not now?

Mr. KAY: I will explain why the advisory council came to the decision they did. The millers have their point of view. They pointed out that they were paying for these screenings and were entitled to sell them. They pointed out that if they were compelled to keep the screenings separate and not mix them with one of the three by-products it would entail very heavy expense in changing the machinery of the mill. It would mean that every miller would have to add another conveyor to his mill, in order to have the screenings separated from the other feed.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Why did the millers not wait till the bill went through before doing anything? They fixed the mill over before the bill went through, and now they want the matter arranged after we pass the act. Why did they not wait till the bill went through the committee? You say millers have changed their mills.

Mr. KAY: No, they would have to change them. If you do not allow screenings to be added to the three by-products, the millers will have to change their mills, and will have to add another conveyor, in order to keep the screenings away from the mill feeds.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that the screenings and shorts are now separate, and they have to have a conveyor to convey them together? Would it not simplify the matter to keep them separate when they are separate?

Mr. KAY: I am afraid I am not an expert on milling; I know very little about it. But the millers who appeared before this committee were able to convince the committee that they had a good case, and that was the argument they put up. The members of that committee were a pretty representative body of men. They had a desire for pure feed.

Mr. CALDWELL: Just to make my question a little clearer, is it not a fact that the screenings are all separate in wheat before it is ground, and when the wheat is ground and the shorts separated from the bran and other mill feeds, they are all apart? They have to put in conveyors to convey their screenings into the shorts at the present time and mix them again.

Mr. KAY: Well, I have stated the argument that they put up. I am not going to undertake to go into the details of the milling business. I understand that it would entail a very heavy expenditure on each mill, if they were compelled to keep their screenings separate. I understand there is a conveyor for bran, another for shorts and another for middlings—three conveyors. This is to convey the ground feed to the mixing room. They can take the screenings and mix them with one of the three products, or mix them with all three, and use the machinery they have. That is the argument which they presented to this committee. If you compel the mills to add this expense and make the extra investment, the result will be that the cost of our feed will go up.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): I would like the hon. member to show where the extra expense is; because certainly the waste is taken away from the wheat before it is ground. It is then reground and run back through the same spout as the other wheat.

Mr. KAY: If my hon. friends who are asking questions are experts on milling I would be glad if they will tell us the process of milling and grinding. I have said that I do not know. I only know what was stated before the advisory board. The arguments were advanced by the millers and feeders, and this bill represents the best judgment of that committee.

Mr. HALBERT: Perhaps the hon. member would let the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) tell us about the expense.

Mr. KAY: I think I had better finish my remarks, and the other members may then address the Chair.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the hon. member consider it more advisable to allow the millers to continue the present process by having some machinery in, rather than to discourage the breeding of live stock in this country? Which is the more important?

Mr. KAY: I do not quite get the gist of my hon. friend's remarks. I hope ultimately to have all the by-products of wheat pure; but I believe, and the members who were on this committee with me believed, that for the present the best interests of the farmers of this country and the interest of the breeders would be served by allowing the screenings to be mixed with the shorts.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask a question?

Mr. KAY: I think I should be permitted to finish and then I shall be pleased to answer questions later.

Mr. CALDWELL: This is not a technical question. I would like to ask the hon. member, just in what way did the committee consider it would benefit the breeders of live stock to have filth and screenings mixed with good feed?

Mr. KAY: There is a demand from many breeders for recleaned screenings. The millers said, "If you compel us to make all the by-products of wheat pure, we will have to put up the price of the bran and shorts, feed-flour and middlings." It seemed to the majority of the members of that committee—and they were practically unanimous—that this was the best arrangement we could arrive at. That was the feeling after the meeting was over, because it was thought the screenings were a good thing. There is a certain demand for screenings, and screenings for the feeding of mature stock are a better food than shorts alone. So long as the farmer knows what he is buying,—so long as the container is marked "shorts" and "screenings," in letters the same size, or "pure shorts," or "pure bran," or "pure middlings" or "pure feed-flour," it was thought the farmers would be adequately protected against feeding screenings to young stock, to which it would be injurious, as against compelling the mills to make it all pure. The reason was that we would get our other feed at a cheaper price. That sums up the argument as presented to us. I understand that the amount of recleaned screenings which left Fort William for the East last year was 12,000 tons, and 24,000 tons left the elevators to go West; and the total output of all the mills for the same year was 600,000 tons.

Mr. CALDWELL: Of what?

Mr. KAY: The output of the mills of bran, shorts and feed-flour.

Mr. CALDWELL: And flour too?

Mr. KAY: No.

Mr. BROWN: If the mills would only grind that recleaned screening there would not be any necessity for mixing it with anything else in order to have it sold at its feeding value. It is only because they want to mix in some of that dirt that has no feeding value that they want to cover it up in the bran and shorts. That is the plain situation—that our cleaned screenings are good feed, and no one will refuse to buy them at their value. We have seen them composed of a certain percentage of wild oats, cracked wheat and the flax and stuff that is real good, and will sell at their value anywhere; and it is only because the millers want to cover up the mustard and dirt and the wild unpalatable stuff that they put this in at all.

Mr. KAY: The weeds that go into the large mills are very thoroughly cleaned. The mustard and the similar weeds are all taken out.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The contrary is absolutely the case.

Mr. KAY: I am not talking about screenings which come from an elevator. I am talking about screenings which come from a mill after the wheat is cleaned ready for grinding. That is what goes into shorts at present. For the last year the mills, following this bill almost exactly, have been putting their screenings into their shorts, and they have been making bran middlings and feed-flour, clean.

Mr. BROWN: On the advisory council, did these gentlemen mention anything about the point I brought up, about scourings being put in? I say that scourings are put in, and I know whereof I speak.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown). The millers in the first place clean that wheat as thoroughly as

it is possible to clean it from all foreign substances. Now they want to pollute the by-products with mill sweepings and dirt of all kinds, and to make the mixture so that it is not fit for animal food. In my experience as a cattle breeder, I have come across instances where this was adulterated to such an extent that it was not fit for food at all. If they want to sell rubbish, let them sell it on its merits; if they want to sell screenings, let them sell that on its merits; but let them sell bran and shorts for what they really are as they come from the mill.

At the end of paragraph (d) clause 2, there are two lines which read:

> No person shall manufacture pure shorts and shorts and mill screenings at the same mill.

What does that mean?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was decided the other day to cut that out.

Mr. KAY: There is only one way by which we will get all our feeds pure, and that is when our friends in the West will have their grain cleaned as it leaves the elevators and will keep their dirt, weeds, and so forth, on their own farms.

Mr. BROWN: That is our business.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): What does the hon. member think of Ontario where we feed hundreds of thousands of tons of that stuff that comes east? How are we going to keep our farms in Ontario clean? No mill can grind all that stuff so as to kill all the weeds. We on this side of the House would like to know who on that committee were real farmers. I am afraid on that committee there were only one or two men belonging to the farming industry. The rest were millers and sympathizers with the millers.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think my hon. friend should make that statement. Why make a reflection—

Mr. BLACK (Huron): It is no reflection.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: —of that nature, when there is no justification for it?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): He is not making a reflection.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. gentleman pointed out that, with the exception of two men, the rest were sympathizers with the millers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): All right.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was at a luncheon with them. Am I to be classified as a sympathizer with the millers?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Perhaps.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend may take that attitude if he likes. I said that I did not believe in going to the one extreme of mixing things indiscriminately, or to the other extreme of prohibiting mixing altogether.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Let us do the mixing ourselves.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend knew a little more about the matter, he would know that that was not practicable. As regards what the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) says, if these mills all bought their wheat directly from the farmers, he is absolutely right that they could do what they liked with the screenings; that they could
5 p.m. throw it into the gutter if they liked. It did not cost them anything except for handling. I do not know what percentage of wheat is marketed in that way, but a comparatively small quantity is purchased directly from the farmers, when one considers that our wheat is spread over the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Let us forget the millers and think of those who are using those by-products. What is in their best interest? I am confident, if a waste ensues as a result of millers buying these screenings as wheat and not being able to sell it to advantage, or if a loss ensues thereby to the millers, they are bound to make that up by larger profits on some other branch of their activities. This is not like farming. If a farmer loses, he has to lose—I do not know how that comes about, but that is the way the thing works—if a manufacturer loses, he has some way of tacking that on to something else. You may think that is not right, but that is what happens. The miller is going to make more on his bran, shorts, middlings and low-grade flour, probably on his high-grade flour, to make up what he loses on the wheat. I am not arguing that that is right, but that is the way in which the thing works out. Is it in our interest to make a provision that results in that, and possibly to disappoint many farmers who want to buy that mixture? I see the hon. member for Glengarry and Stormont (Mr. Kennedy) having a good time listening. I do not suppose there is in this chamber an hon. gentleman who has more experience than he with regard to feeding by-products. I do not profess to

have such recent knowledge as he has, and I should like to hear what he has to say. My impression, as I say, is against any form of mixture. My judgment is that it is not wise to go to the other extreme and to prohibit it altogether. There are certain people who want to buy a blend. Why prevent them from buying it? There would be no deception. The fact that it is a mixture will be marked on the bag. If you do not like to buy it, you do not need to do so. You can take the pure stuff. You have the two choices, the mixture on the one hand, and the pure bran or shorts or middlings on the other. Let us forget that we have any sympathies or prejudices, and let us just use our judgment and get the best bill possible under the circumstances.

Mr. HALBERT: Would we have any way of knowing what quantity of shorts and screenings there were in the mixture? There might be a gallon of shorts and the rest screenings.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I know that is hard to regulate, but it is spoken of as "mill run."

Mr. BLACK (Huron): The minister says that there is no deception. Why not keep the screenings by themselves and let us do the mixing ourselves? Then there will be no deception.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the committee is willing, I am agreeable.

Mr. HAMMELL: I would like to give the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Black) a list of the members on that committee. He stated that there were no members there representing the farmers. The chairman was Mr. Clark, Seed Commissioner of Canada. There was Dr. Grisdale, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who could not be said to be in sympathy with the millers. Mr. J. E. Brethour, representing the Swine Breeders' Association of Ontario was a member. My hon. friend will know him as one of the best and biggest farmers in western Ontario. Mr. Stonehouse, of the National Dairy Council, was another member who was there representing the Eastern Dairymens' Association. The hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) was a member, and he is a farmer of some repute. I do not think the hon. gentleman will doubt that statement. I happen to have had the privilege of being there myself. There were only three other gentlemen there representing the millers, as compared with six of us representing the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN: The debate is getting away from clause 1 which we are considering.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. LOVIE: There seems to be a good deal of discussion how bran, shorts and flour are manufactured. In my district there has been for the last thirty years, a mill to which we take wheat and get back flour, bran and shorts. Only those three products, nothing else, are manufactured at that mill. The wheat is certainly cleaned before it is ground, and the screenings are crushed and sold. These are the products: flour, bran, shorts, and the ground screenings can be purchased as chop which is good feed for either cattle or hogs. As regards the quantity, that miller would always give 36 pounds of flour, 10 of bran and 10 of shorts. There was thus 4 pounds left to take care of anything left in the wheat. They figured this a loss of four pounds on every bushel. Consequently the miller is suffering no loss at all. We know with certainty that the milling companies, having their elevators all over the three prairie provinces, are able to buy wheat extensively and it is docked as bought. The farmer is not paid for any screenings; these are made a present of to the miller and the freight is paid to Fort William. Besides, the millers are able to purchase wheat at the street price, that is, the Fort William price less storage and transportation charges; consequently if they ship those screenings out the freight is already paid. Therefore we who want pure bran and shorts demand the opportunity of getting them absolutely pure. Those of us last winter who wanted to buy pure bran could not get it, —there was 7 per cent of screenings in it. No mill in the country is so equipped as to be able to grind these screenings, they can be ground only at the big central mills. In a word, the mixture of screenings in our feed stuffs is a fraud, and we do not want to see it carried on any longer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We are getting a little light on this question of commercial feed stuffs. The minister (Mr. Motherwell) states that he is sympathetic with the desire to have all mill feeds pure, and the chairman of the committee on Agriculture (Mr. Kay) states that that is his view also, and that he hopes ultimately we will arrive at this desirable state of affairs. It seems to me that we are becoming a little more involved from year to year in dealing with this question. In 1919 the millers' representatives gave evidence before the committee on the Cost of Living, evidence which does not bear out the conclusions reached by the chairman of the committee on Agriculture. They claimed there was no difficulty whatever in keeping screenings separate, in fact it was stated that the

wheat had to go through seven different processes before it was in a condition fit to be milled into flour, and that the large mills contained up to date appliances by which the screenings could be ground and distributed equally among the by-products. It was claimed by the millers' representatives at that time that if they were not permitted to dispose of the screenings in this way they would have to increase the price of their flour. This was the excuse put forward. And in face of that we had abundance of evidence to show that thousands of animals were being poisoned as a result of this stuff being fed to them.

Mr. KAY: I do not think my hon. friend wishes to misrepresent me. I do not say that the millers cannot separate the screenings from the other mill feed, but if they do separate them it will entail a heavy invesment on the part of each mill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Black, of the Ogilvie Milling Company, in his sworn evidence before the committee on June 23rd, 1919, was asked the question:

Nothing to do with the mills?

And he said in reply:

Nothing whatever. However, we could eliminate that if it was so desired, but we then would turn it over and sell it for what we could get. That might mean that you would have to increase the cost of the flour to some extent, because we might not be able to get as much for it in some other form as in bran or shorts.

They know very well they could not dispose of it as flour, but owing to the dark colour of the bran and shorts they could mix screenings and other dirt with it and in that way dispose of it. We had some very good evidence from the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) this session with regard to the methods pursued in the West. Apparently the latter has had practical experience, and so has the Minister of Agriculture. The member for Saltcoats was explaining how easy it was to take out most of these objectionable seeds right at the farm when the grain was being threshed. It is a very simple process. The thresher is paid so much per bushel but when there is a lot of weeds in the grain he stated that the farmer will not pay the thresher for the weed seeds if separated from the grain, consequently the thresher closes the shoe and allows all the weed seeds to come out with the grain, in this way getting paid for his threshing. "Everyone knows that," the minister called out across the House; "that is exactly what they do." Or words to that effect.

So we might as well look at this matter fairly and squarely. In fact the wheat purchased in western Canada that does not pass through the terminal elevators contains as much as 10 per cent weed seeds. Evidence before the committee showed that that is very often the case. Naturally, there is a great inducement for the millers to utilize this stuff in some way and dispose of it at a profit. I do not think there is any other way of dealing with this adulteration than by absolutely prohibiting millers mixing screenings with feed stuffs. Of course, they cannot possibly adulterate their flour in this way, but, so far as bran and shorts are concerned, the millers should not be permitted to put this dirt back into the bran and shorts.

Mr. LOVIE: Did the millers pay for the 10 per cent screenings in the wheat they purchased?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Not in the West. Where wheat is purchased at the elevators and cleaned and contains less than 3 per cent, the millers do pay; but not on grain purchased on the street and shipped direct without passing through the terminal elevator, unless they dock the seller of the grain. I do not know whether they do or not. In 1919 as a result of the evidence then obtained a bill was introduced by myself and referred to the committee on Agriculture for their consideration. The committee recommended that the bill should be put into effect. Thereupon the House passed the bill, which absolutely prohibited the adulteration of mill feeds such as bran and shorts in any way. The following session a Department of Health was created, and it took over part of the machinery for enforcing the act. I believe there is a fragment of this act on the statute books to-day. In the following session the present act was passed, and at the time I pointed out what I thought would be the result. I regret to say that exactly what I predicted has happened. I might be permitted to read one paragraph of my statement:

The effect of this clause will be that mill feeds of this kind will be mixed and you will get but a very small proportion of pure bran and shorts. This clause is a departure from the old act, and instead of being an advance along the lines which we desire, it is going in the opposite direction. It is making provision for the mixing of all these feeding stuffs and having the mixture disposed of to suit the convenience of the mill feed men.

What have we experienced since that time? We have found in Ontario—which I know better than any other part of the Dominion—that it is absolutely impossible to buy pure bran and shorts, although provision was made in the act for keeping those pure. But there is a distinction. These are sold as feed stuffs; the other is sold as commercial feed stuff, and

must have printed on the container, "Screenings not exceeding mill run." You will find these words on the bottom of the container, but it gets covered over and no one realizes it is there. Under the present act a farmer is not often able to purchase pure mill feed, but has to take what he can get at the price demanded. This stuff is being palmed off on the farmers and their stock poisoned in consequence. The Department of Agriculture has abundant evidence to show that this is the case. This evidence has been put on record on previous occasions, and I shall not take up the time of the committee in referring to it. But the minister says he has intimate knowledge of the conditions both in western and in eastern Canada, and he says that his sympathies are with the keeping of mill feeds pure. He should, therefore, take steps to see that that is done. I wrote the minister a year ago in regard to the matter and was informed that some steps were to be taken to provide a remedy. I directed his attention to the subject on two or three occasions during the present session, and I was informed that a bill to this effect would be brought down. I have only to-day had an opportunity of looking over the bill;—I was not here when the resolution was discussed last week,—and I must say I am very much disappointed to find that there is to be no progress along the desired lines.

What is the use of trying to make the people believe that the millers cannot overcome the difficulties? The millers can adapt themselves to these conditions very quickly, if a change is demanded and if they do so they will find it much more satisfactory in the end; they will find that there will be a greater demand for mill feeds than there has ever been. The farmers are passing through a trying period. The one hope for the future of agriculture is the live stock industry, and you cannot successfully engage in that industry without an abundance of mill feeds such as bran and shorts. Under the old system of milling there were only the three products, but with the modern system there are four or five different products. By the way, this matter of an increase in products was referred to the committee on Agriculture two years ago and it was then decided that the sale of a new product of the milling of wheat would not be permitted. I was amazed to find that notwithstanding that attitude of the committee on Agriculture, the department did put this measure into effect. The recommendations of the committee were adsolutely ignored and the requests of the millers were granted. I am afraid the millers are the only ones who are receiving consideration to-day. I regret very much to have to speak in this way, but I have taken a stand on this matter for the last ten years, and the conditions instead of getting better are getting worse from year to year. The farmers are getting discouraged. Buildings that have cost them hundreds, in some cases, thousands of dollars, are to-day empty. They are not engaging in the raising of hogs, a branch of farming that should be very profitable, to anything like the extent desirable. Now, something should be done. The minister does not appear to realize that this advisory committee was appointed on his recommendation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The names were recommended to me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The member for Muskoka (Mr. Hammell) has given us some information as to who they were; I believe there was authority for appointing about sixteen members on that committee. Now, we have had a special committee on Agriculture sitting from almost the beginning to the end of this session; they could have looked into this matter had it been referred to them, and I think they would have been better employed than they were, because apparently not much consideration was given to this question. Let me inform the committee as to something that happened in 1917. A very strenuous debate has taken place for several sessions with regard to the manufacture of oleomargarine. It is important to note that the first steps taken to destroy the commercial feed stuffs and the grain standards of this country were taken by order in council in December 1917 on the recommendation of the then Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I have copies of the orders in council here. Steps were taken also to purchase the screenings at the terminal elevators at $35 a ton, and for some time they were disposed of to the farmer. In view of the mixture which was permitted I have come to the conclusion—because the Oleomargarine Act was put through just about the same time—that the idea was to obtain a feed for a dairy cow with a view to producing oleomargarine instead of butter. There is an item in the supplementary estimates of $700,000 for the health of animals. I say that if you put something in this bill that will prevent the adulteration of mill feeds you will do more for the health of animals than the voting of this $700,000 to which I refer, or than the payment of $900,000 for veterinary and lay inspectors in the abattoirs and elsewhere throughout the country, as now provided for.

Mr. MILLAR: I do not wish to delay the committee very long, because several members have already referred to the extent of the practice of mixing foul seed with mill feed. For many years it has been most difficult to get bran that is fit to feed to the stock, in fact in many cases the stock turn from it. One hon. member has stated that if we do not enact the legislation now before us, it will be necessary for the mills, at considerable expense, to change their machinery. But I assure the committee that unless a change is made very soon it will be a case either of the mills changing their machinery or of some of the live stock changing their digestive apparatus. When foul seed, which are bitter in taste, are ground up and mixed with the bran the resulting mixture is not only unpalatable but injurious to the health of the animals. At first it appeared to me to be not unwise to allow this bill to go through, the Minister of Agriculture having said that the purchasers would have an opportunity of buying or of not buying, as they pleased; they could get the pure bran or they could get the mixture. On second thought, however, I do not think it would be wise to do that. There has been much abuse in the past, and in all probability very little of the pure bran would be offered for sale if this was permitted. The farmers who wanted feed very badly would be willing to pay a higher price for the pure feed if they could get it, but the pure feed not being available they would be forced to buy the impure stuff. I do not see any reason why any suggested necessity for change in machinery should be allowed to affect the case. That is a mere excuse; there is really no good reason in it at all. It has been pointed out that the seeds must be cleaned from the grain in any case. I would point out that it is often cheaper to handle a large quantity of one kind of commodity than to have it divided up into a large number of classes. This bill will provide for several such classes, and the result will be to add to the expense. I feel certain that those who are feeding the stock will be better served if they can have the bran in its pure state.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The bran cannot be put into the screenings—shorts and screenings is the mixture we are dealing with. Bran will be sold in its purity.

Mr. MILLAR: My argument, then, would apply to shorts only, not to bran. I think it is better to have shorts in its pure state and that the screenings be sold for what they actually are. If that is done the result will be more satisfactory to the buyers. They have experience enough to know just what they are suitable for, and I know quite well that this material can be fed to advantage. For that reason I feel I must support the amendment. I do not know that it has been moved yet, but I understand an amendment is to be moved to have these mill products sold for what they really are.

Mr. ROBB: The debate this afternoon has shown that the country is unanimous in its desire for pure feeds for live stock, and with that view I am entirely in sympathy, but may I point out that there is one way, and a primary way, in which we could help to provide the eastern dairymen and the western breeder with pure feed for live stock that would avoid the mixing of weed seed, and that is not to grow weed seeds. Do hon. gentlemen object to that?

Mr. FORKE: It is utterly impossible.

Mr. ROBB: How is it that we cannot get the good mill feed to-day that we could buy some years ago, is a question often asked. Well, some years ago the millers of this country were able to buy grain that was comparatively free from dirty weed seeds.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it not true that the weeds purchased with these mill feeds have been distributed all over the old provinces?

Mr. ROBB: I was just coming to that. But there developed a method of farming in this country, surface farming, what is called in western Canada mining a farm, the result of which has been that the pure virgin soil on which good clean grain used to be grown has now reached a condition through careless methods of farming where it grows a very large percentage of dirty weed seeds. I think all hon. gentlemen will admit that. These dirty weed seeds have been carried over to eastern Canada through the mill feeds and the grain bought, and they have dirtied all the farms so that as you drive through the countryside you notice the deplorably dirty conditions of the farms.

Mr. SALES: Where did the seeds come from into that grain grown in the West?

Mr. ROBB: I have had some experience. I was brought up on a farm and day after day we were sent out to weed mustard and keep the farm clean. I admit that that cannot be done on a large farm in the West, but I say that that is one way in which everyone can help to eliminate these weed seeds.

There is another way in the meantime which will help, and it was pointed out by my hon. friend from Oxford county. There is, I am told, a threshing separator that cleans these

weed seeds fairly well on the farm, and if the farmers would help in that way and take out as much of the weed seeds as they could on the farm, there would be that much less to go to the mill. You would really believe to listen to the debate to-day that the average miller wanted dirty weed seeds. Surely no one believes that. The better and cleaner the wheat, the more the miller is willing to pay for it and the more profit he can make. In anything the Minister of Agriculture can do to compel the sale of pure mill feed I am with him. I am in the business. I represent two firms that pride themselves on pure mill feeds, but I also know that if a man goes out and offers a mill feed with some dirt in it for 25 cents less the feeder is ready to buy the dirty feed. There are a very limited number of mills in Canada, and I know them, that are running their dirty seeds into the mill feed.

There is another danger, however, to live stock that in my judgment is far more feared than the weed seeds coming from the run of the mills or from the elevators, and that is the oatmeal mill that grinds out the hulls and runs them into the bran and shorts. I think that is a greater danger to the stock than the seeds if they are ground up fine. I have said enough, I think, to indicate that I am in favour of pure mill feed, and in favour of anything that can be done to secure a larger supply of pure mill feed.

We have had a complaint from some hon. gentlemen that bran was unobtainable, that they could not buy bran at any price. That is true in a degree, and possibly the more restrictions we impose and the more we hamper trade the harder we make it for ourselves to get what we want, for after all there are only a limited number of mills that follow this practice of mixing their seeds. The majority of mills in Canada pride themselves on putting out good mill feed. I will give hon. gentlemen one reason why mill feed is scarce in this country. I have here the records of exports for the years 1921, 1922 and 1923, and I find that in the year 1922 the total export of bran, shorts and middlings was 729,718 bags of 100 pounds each. In 1923 the total export was 2,300,353 bags of 100 pounds each, so we exported in 1923 almost three times the quantity exported in 1922. I am not stating that the regulations imposed had anything to do with this increased export, but it is clear that the export business was more profitable to the miller and consequently he put his stuff in another market. I am reminded that quite recently we in Canada were very much disturbed over certain regulations that the British government proposed to impose on the import of flour to that country. They were going to compel all importers of flour to import along with a bag of flour its equivalent in mill feed so far as weight is concerned. That shows the importance of supporting such measures as will secure to us good feed, but let us not put such restrictions upon mill feed in this country as will make it more profitable for the millers to export their mill feed to another country. I am with the Minister of Agriculture in anything he can do in this matter. I favoured the bill he had the other day for pure bran, pure shorts and pure middlings, and for the sale of screenings as screenings and branded as screenings. If that is done, Mr. Chairman, it is not the Canadian miller who will suffer. It will not hurt his business but it might hurt the man who is growing weed seeds.

Mr. SALES: There is a difference between the situation in the West and in the East.

Mr. ROBB: Hear, hear.

Mr. SALES: In the West—there are very large mills situated at Calgary, Medicine Hat, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Winnipeg into which the farmer's wheat goes directly and is graded and docked. The millers get the screenings and the seeds absolutely free, with the freight paid not only into their mills but as far as Fort William; it costs them nothing. I say that if this regulation goes into effect it will be absolutely impossible for the western farmer to buy shorts at all, that is pure shorts, because whether the percentage of seeds is one per cent, 2 per cent, 3 per cent, or even 8 per cent the millers will endeavour to get rid of the whole thing, which is a gift to them, as shorts and screenings. With regard to the eastern miller the situation is somewhat different. If the inspector at the head of the lakes is not doing his duty, and is allowing screenings and seeds to go through there, it seems to me the course for the millers to take is to appeal against that inspection. I find there is a provision in the Grain Act for a grain survey board. It is provided that on the recommendation of the boards of trade of Toronto and Montreal respectively there may be appointed for any eastern division a grain survey board composed of such number of fit and skilful persons in each case as is considered necessary. There is also a provision that when the owner of any inspected grain is not satisfied he may appeal to the chief inspector; and further, if he is not satisfied with the decision of the chief inspector he may appeal to the board. I think that is the proper course for the eastern miller to take in this

regard, instead of trying to pass off a camouflaged adulteration. We have far too much adulteration in this country. The minister of Agriculture says that if we do not want to buy this so-called shorts we need not. I may say, however, that time and time again we cannot buy either bran or shorts unless we are prepared to take the flour with it.

Now as to the point the Minister of Trade and Commerce made when he quoted the figures that seven hundred and some odd thousand hundredweight had been exported in 1922. I happen to have here figures prepared by the Bureau of Statistics and they show 854,829 hundredweight were exported in 1922. But there is another interesting point which the minister did not mention—

Mr. ROBB: There seems to be a difference in the figures. To what period do my hon. friend's figures apply?

Mr. SALES: To the period ending March 31st.

Mr. ROBB: The figures I quoted were for the period ending in May.

Mr. SALES: But the interesting point is this: The value is also given and it is $939,910. This works out at $1.02 per hundred weight, showing a value of over $20 a ton. I should like to ask any hon. member sitting near me, from the West or from the East, if he was able to buy either bran, or shorts, or middlings at $20 per ton in 1922.

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend allow me right there?—the explanation will run in line with his figures. These exports are based on the f.o.b. price at the point of shipment. Now, most of this mill feed is exported from western mills so that the figures are based on the price f.o.b. at that mill. To arrive at the price at which the feed is sold in eastern Canada you would have to add the cost of the freight, seeing that the shipment may have been made from Alberta or western Saskatchewan.

Mr. SALES: That does not quite explain the situation either.

Mr. ROBB: It may not as regards the West but it does in the case of the East.

Mr. SALES: That will not explain the situation in the West where no freight cost is incurred whatever. For instance take Saskatoon or Moose Jaw where the farmers live around the mills. When the feed is sold to them there is no charge for freight to Fort William. The millers grind the wheat there and yet at times we have not been able to get sufficient feed at any price. The price to us has been $24 a ton when apparently they were willing to ship feed out at $20. That situation is not right. The same thing occurs in the case of flour. We pay very nearly the same price for flour right at the point where it is ground, without any freight on it, that Montreal flour is quoted at. I am glad to receive the minister's assurance on the matter because I did not understand at what point the freight was added, but even with his explanation I contend that the farmers of the West are suffering a great injustice by reason of the price they have to pay for flour and for bran and shorts. If any amendment is moved I shall certainly support it. I should like to see the words "shorts" and "mill screenings" cut out altogether and make it read "pure bran, shorts, feed flour and screenings." I understood the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) to say that these screenings had a great feeding value, and that they were even worth more than shorts. If the screenings are so good let the millers sell them for what they are and get all the profit they can out of them; we do not want to deprive them of that profit when the screenings are sold separately.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no amendment before the committee. The unfortunate thing is we have not a bill here based on the amended resolution. I have one of the other bills that has been amended in accordance with the resolution. There is nothing for it but to pass the bill in conformity with the resolution, or else get a new bill drafted.

Mr. CALDWELL: In conformity with the amended resolution?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The amended resolution. If we strike out the word "pure" in subsection (d) of section 1 it will be in conformity with the resolution as amended the other day.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the word "pure" be struck from the sub-paragraph (d)?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Sub-paragraph (d) refers to "bran, shorts or middlings when unmixed with other materials." I am unable to grasp what the minister means by proposing to strike out the word "pure." The bill is so ambiguous that I doubt whether anyone can make head or tail of it in its present form. It appears to me as though the object were to enable people to evade its provisions.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is not necessary to have the word "pure." The clause was

drawn that way when it provided for a mixture of shorts and screenings. That would imply that there is another kind of shorts that is not pure. Consequently it is thought better to omit the word "pure."

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister will understand that there is really no difference between bran and shorts except that one contains about one per cent more protein. The bran is gound up fine now and disposed of as shorts. This has been the custom in the past. By adding some of the screenings or lower grade flour, they were able to dispose of the bran as shorts. To-day it is almost impossible to purchase pure bran, notwithstanding it is claimed they are not permitted to adulterate it now but it is ground up and disposed of in this way. I think the minister would be well advised, even at this late date, to alter the bill, so that it would conform with the view expressed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The importance of this bill to the live stock industry under present conditions is so great that I think it would be most unfortunate if this session should end without something being done along this line. I am satisfied that pure mill feed would mean more to agriculture in this country than all the money that is being spent for agricultural purposes. I am so firmly convinced as to this that I will venture to make that statement. The millers admit there is absolutely no difficulty; and if you put this into effect you will find the millers will be quite competent to take care of themselves, that nobody will be able to sell weed seeds to the millers and get anything for them, and that consequently it will encourage better farming, and overcome the great difficulty which we have. These weed seeds came into the country in an insidious way, and obtained a foothold before the people realized in many instances what they were at all. I can understand the difficulties they have to contend with in farming in western Canada. In fact, weed seeds were introduced into western Canada and even into Ontario from Europe, but it is only recently that people have become acquainted with the fact, and if it continues for a few years, it will be almost impossible to eradicate them. Better farming will be of immense benefit to the country, and live stock is the basis on which agriculture must be built up.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the word "pure" is to appear before the word "shorts," it should be placed before every one of these by-products, middlings, feed-flour and so on. I think we will have to either cut out the word "pure," or if we leave it in, we will have to place it before each one of these commodities. Therefore, I think it should be eliminated and that the words "when sold separately and unmixed with other materials," should be struck out, because that implies the other. Then, after cutting out those words, the word "screenings" should be inserted, because it is a fifth by-product. It appears in the next section. It will then read, "bran, shorts, middlings, feed-flour and screenings."

Mr. SALES: If the minister consents to cutting out the word "pure" and to the other changes, will he allow section 9 on page 2 to stand?

Mr. CALDWELL: No, that will be cut out, too. The words "shorts and" would require to be cut out as well.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It will have to be made to conform to the idea of a pure article all through.

Mr. SALES: The point I am making is that adulteration or misleading tagging or labelling, and so on, is absolutely prohibited.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think when we get to that, it will have to be made to conform with the idea that every one of the five must be in itself distinct with nothing attached to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the motion is carried, would it not be well for the officers of the department to look into this matter, and have the amendment made, so that the bill will operate successfully.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The worst is past, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the consensus of opinion is the same as in 1919. I will read a resolution which was moved by me which was passed by the committee of Agriculture at that time, when my bill was referred to it. It reads:

> That in view of the serious results from the feeding of adulterated bran and shorts by adding thereto great quantities of weed seeds both ground and unground annually resulting in the death of many animals and serious injury to the health of others, besides distributing harmful weed seeds throughout the country to the detriment of those who engage in agriculture, this committee would respectfully recommend that immediate action should be taken to deal with this question by passing and putting into effect at the earliest opportunity bill No. 7 an act to amend the adulteration act.

That resolution absolutely prohibits mixing.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the word "pure" be struck out?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Strike out the word "and" before the words "feed-flour".

The CHAIRMAN: Then the words "the products of wheat" are to remain, and the words "when sold separately and unmixed with other materials" are to be struck out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is what we agreed just now should be cut out.

On the "yeas" and "nays" being called:

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment carried. Then paragraph (d) will read—

Bran, pure shorts, middlings, feed-flour, and screenings, the products of wheat.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I did not hear the amendment read.

Mr. CALDWELL: There seems to be a contradiction. Screenings are not a product of wheat.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The product of wheat and wheat screening. You will get the wheat as the result of screening, and the other four by-products as the result of milling.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is this not merely a definition as to what constitutes food stuffs? The commercial feed stuffs are left as they were.

Mr. ROBB: Have the words "when sold separately and unmixed with other materials" been struck out?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: I think it should read this way, "when sold separately and unmixed."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But that is implying that it is mixed. That will be a mistake, because it is giving a tip for them to go on mixing.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 2, paragraph (a)—By-products resulting from cleaning, etc., of wheat forbidden, except when properly tagged.

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been proposed by Mr. Caldwell that the words, in the 23rd line, "shorts and mill screenings" be struck out.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is in subsection (a)? In the same line I think the word "pure" should be struck out, before the words "shorts and mill screenings".

Amendment agreed to.

On Section 2, paragraph (b)—When free from certain admixture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move that the word "pure" before the word "shorts" be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

On Section 2, paragraph (c)—Percentage by weight in each case.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move that in the first line the word "pure" before the word "shorts" and the words "shorts and" be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should like to call the minister's attention to line 9. The words "shorts and" should be struck out and the words "mill screenings" left.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the schedule, showing the percentage of fibre, I move that the word "pure" before the word "shorts" be struck out and the words "shorts and" before the words "mill screenings" be struck out. The other classifications remain the same.

Amendment agreed to.

On Section 2, paragraph (d)—Registration and contents.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move that paragraph (d) be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 2 as amended agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Might I point out that there is possibly a considerable stock of old mill feed on hand? What date does the committee think would be a suitable date on which to bring this legislation into force? It occurred to me that the date should be the 1st of October. That would give us an opportunity of getting these pure mills feeds for the fall litters of pigs, so that they would not have too much fibre in their feed.

Mr. CALDWELL: Carried.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Should this act come into force on the first day of October, 1923, or had we better let it come into force by proclamation?

Mr. CALDWELL: It would be better to name the date.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move an amendment that there be added section 4:

4. This act shall come into force on the 1st day of October, 1923.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: It being six o'clock, I do not suppose you wish to sit further?

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia, $533,884.60.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that we take this vote item by item?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before doing so, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will make some general explanation as to these further estimates brought down, as they are, in the very dying days of the session when we have a great deal of work to dispose of. I would point out to him that we now have our Main Estimates of $466,000,000, the supplementaries of $14,000,000, the construction programme of $28,000,000, the additional supplementaries brought down for the year closed of $18,000,000, the bonus supplement of $5,500,000, the liability to be undertaken in connection with the endorsement under the bill which has received second reading of $15,000,000, and the Supplementary Estimates tabled to-day of nearly $15,000,000—making a grand total of $548,750,714. With a very large deficit this year, and with an estimated revenue much less than last year, how does my hon. friend expect we are going to pay for all this—where is the money coming from—what is the loaning programme—how is the country to be financed? Surely we should have some idea where the money is coming from in connection with this vote.

Mr. FIELDING: I regret, Mr. Chairman, that it has been deemed necessary to bring down these estimates at a late stage of the session. If that is a criticism, I am willing to admit there is some ground for it. The only explanation is that we have all been pretty busy—I plead guilty to having had an occasional busy day myself. However, apart from that there is nothing in these estimates that calls for any special criticism or any special explanation. The money is to come from those projects which we have disclosed to the House. If my hon. friend knows any part of these estimates which is not fair and reasonable, it is his pleasure and his duty to point it out to us and, if necessary, challenge the vote of the House upon it. If he is not prepared to do that, I tell him he is not going to alarm the country by rolling up all these figures. Each estimate must stand on its merits. I do not think my hon. friend is going to scare the people at all by his figures. I see nothing remarkable in the situation at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought we had done something. We at least did our best to criticize the estimates that have already been brought down, but our protests were absolutely unavailing and, indeed, some people think we talked too much upon them. That is all we can do. As I pointed out, there is more than the mere voting of the estimates. Here we have a deficit on last year's operations of $58,000,000—

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend knows that that is not correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think my hon. friend is doing himself justice when he makes that remark. He got a credit from other years' operations of $8,000,000 on exchange. He taking credit—

Mr. FIELDING: I am not taking credit for it. The item appears in the accounts. There is no other place to put it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He taking credit for that, reduces the total sum of the deficit. There is no doubt about that. He never for one moment tried to conceal it. Therefore my hon. friend is not doing himself justice when he says I am saying something that I know is not so. I do not think he meant to say it. At any rate I am going to think that he did not mean it. We will take the deficit as we have it with the adventitious fund of $8,000,000. Such a windfall will not occur again this year, and even with it the deficit is bad enough. Now in the face of this total vote of over $548,000,000, surely my hon. friend cannot think that one is merely trying to alarm the public by referring to what he is doing. There is no attempt at alarming the public. We are all interested in trying to get things down to something like a normal working basis. The income called for by my hon. friend's budget falls very far short of this huge total. I did ask him in all sincerity where the money is coming from. He is not telling me. I can do nothing more than I have done already in connection with the votes that have been passed—simply register my protest.

Mr. PAPINEAU: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Sir Henry Drayton) who has just

taken his seat called attention to the lateness of the tabling of the Supplementary Estimates. Last Tuesday, after they were tabled, the right hon. leader of the Opposition asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to tell him when in the history of Canada such estimates had been tabled during the last week of the session. I have taken the trouble to go through certain records and have found one precedent. In the session of 1921 when the right hon. leader of the Opposition was Prime Minister—

Mr. FIELDING: And my hon. friend was Minister of Finance.

Mr. PAPINEAU: On Monday, the 30th May, 1921, at about one o'clock in the morning, Supplementary Estimates for $23,959,842.14 were tabled. The House prorogued on the 4th of June; that was the Saturday following. That was I think the precedent which the right hon. leader of the Opposition wanted, and he himself is the one who created this precedent when he was then Prime Minister.

The Montreal Gazette of the 31st of May speaking of the Supplementary Estimates amounting to $23,959,842.14 tabled on the 30th of May says:

> The figure is low and indicates a close scrutiny of expenditures. The Main Supplementaries last year totalled $62,000,000 and the year before $36,700,000.

That was not including the bonus for the Civil Service which the leader of the Opposition wanted to include in the supplementaries this year. There may be, I admit, some discussion as to whether these supplementaries might not have been brought down a little earlier in the session, but I do not believe that the strong protest of the right hon. leader of the Opposition was justified in any way, shape or form.

Mr. FORKE: I wish to say a few words with regard to these Supplementary Estimates, and what I am going to say I am sure is without prejudice. I do not think it makes a great deal of difference to consider this right or wrong now because it has been done before. I notice that the Supplementary Estimates for public works in Nova Scotia are larger than the main estimates for that purpose.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend allow me a question? Does he not believe in the principle "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone?"

Mr. FORKE: I hardly know where I have sinned anyway. The thing is in bad practice. I have no great experience with procedure in the House of Commons, but just from a common business standpoint I think it is bad practice to bring down such a large amount of estimates at the end of the session. Among the items that appear in these estimates I might mention the increase in salaries to the deputy ministers. I am not in a position to make any criticism as to whether that is right or wrong. I believe in paying what the work is worth, and if we get efficient servants to do our work we ought to pay them a reasonable sum, but I do claim, Mr. Chairman, that this must have been within the knowledge of the government when the Main Estimates were brought down, and I should like to know why it was not included in the Main Estimates. I want to register my protest against such a large sum being brought down at the end of the session when we have not time to get the information to enable us to criticise these different items. Take the estimates for Nova Scotia for instance. What information have we in this part of the House, at all events, upon which we could offer any intelligent criticism other than that we think this is a large sum of money for the purpose?

Mr. CARROLL: I would ask the hon. member, does he take exception to any specific vote for Nova Scotia in these Supplementary Estimates, and if so which one?

Mr. FORKE: I was just on that point when the hon. gentleman interrupted me. I was saying that it was a large sum of money, and that we were not in a position to criticize. It is a large sum of money to vote without any particular knowledge of the circumstances. Had these been brought down at the time of the Main Estimates we could have made inquiries and got some information before we were asked to vote this money. We are not finding fault if the money is properly spent. You can be extravagant in spending a little, and you can practise economy in spending a great deal. It all depends on how you spend it. I want to register my protest against this practice. I believe it is a wrong principle, and because hon. gentlemen opposite are not able to cast the first stone does not make it any better.

While I am on my feet I just want to say that we are nearing the end of the session, and I think we are all anxious to get through. I do not want to be critical, though I think that intelligent criticism is all right, but I should like to say that we waste a good deal of time in this House in wandering into by-paths and raking up old things that took place years ago and that are of no interest to us in this part of the House at all events.

I am not referring to intelligent criticism. I would like if possible to come right down to business. Let us get on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to say just a word in reference more particularly to the remarks of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance and the right hon. leader of the Opposition. As far as I have been able to gather, the impression they have sought to convey is that the government in some way or other has sought to delay bringing down the estimates till the last of the month. I think it is important that not only the House but the country should understand that so far as the Main Estimates are concerned, and they are the large amounts covering the business of the government as a whole, the entire Main Estimates with the exception of one item had been passed on the 15th of this month. There has been no effort whatever in any way to prevent full discussion of the estimates. It has been a part of the government policy to begin almost immediately after the opening of the House with the estimates, and distribute them day by day over the session so that there would be ample opportunity for the members of the House to discuss every department and every branch of government. What we took such strong exception to in opposition was that the government of the day, while it brought down its estimates at a certain time after the opening of the House, refrained from bringing before the House for purposes of discussion a very large part of the Main Estimates until the last few days of the session. I think if one will look through the records of parliament one will find that the last week or two of parliament during the last few sessions at least—I know that when we were in opposition the end of the session was taken up almost entirely with discussing Main Estimates. Not only that but a great proportion of the Main Estimates were discussed after midnight and until five in the morning. I remember sitting where my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) is sitting now while the government of which he was a member was busy putting through estimates here at night to the amount of millions, and sitting right on until daylight came in through the windows above. I protested strongly, and pointed out that the government was trying to railroad the estimates through the House at a time when it was impossible to have any discussion and I maintained that if ever the then opposition came into office we would see that nothing of that kind was repeated. I just wish to demonstrate to the House the truth of what I have said. If members will look at the Orders of the Day they will find there the dates on which the different supply has been put through this House. They run as follows on the order paper: February 20, February 23, February 27, March 2, March 6, March 8, March 9, March 15, March 22, March 23, March 27, March 28, April 10, April 11, April 12, April 13, April 16, April 19, April 23, April 24, May 4, May 8, May 11, May 28, May 29, May 30, May 31, June 7, June 8, June 11, June 12, June 13, June 14, June 15.

That is the manner in which the present government has submitted the estimates to the House for the purpose of discussion. They have been distributed as evenly as possible over the entire session, giving notice to members always in advance of what was in contemplation so that there would be ample opportunity of discussing fully every item of supply.

Might I draw the attention of the House to this further fact? While we were discussing the estimates I do not think there was a single night, unless by consent all round, that we sat beyond eleven o'clock. What I took strong exception to when in opposition was the fact that items would be passed in supply long after it was possible for members of the press gallery to take any record of what was being said or to send any communication to the press of the country as to the discussion that was taking place here. It has been a deliberate part of the government policy to see that the members of the House had the fullest opportunity of discussing supply, that the country should know every word that was said by any member which might be deemed by the press to be of importance in that regard. We have presented our estimates in consequence in that way and all the main supply was completed by the 15th of this month.

The Supplementary Estimates are possibly a little late in being brought down but, as hon. members know, we have been very busy discussing the budget and there has not been time to give to the Supplementary Estimates, until the greater part of the budget was out of the way, the careful consideration which should be given. But let me say in regard to the Supplementary Estimates—and I say it particularly to my hon. friend from Brandon who has just spoken as to the matter of time, we are all anxious I think to get away at the end of this week if possible—if any member feels that in any particular it is going to prevent or even shorten discussion for the House to prorogue this week I hope he will at once dismiss from his mind any intention on the part of the government to

have it so prorogue. I purpose to-night to have the House adjourn at twelve o'clock so that there will be no discussion on estimates after midnight, and if we are not through tomorrow by midnight we will rise and continue on Saturday till midnight, and if we are not through then we will adjourn and reassemble for discussion of the estimates on Tuesday. I would like that to be thoroughly understood. The government is not going to seek to railroad these estimates through in any particular. Members may have all the time they wish.

Let me add further so far as the Supplementary Estimates are concerned, we have sought to avoid bringing down in the supplementaries items which we thought in any particular would be contentious. My hon. friend from Brandon says that these Supplementary Estimates so far as public works in the province of Nova Scotia are concerned are larger in amount than the Main Estimates, but did my hon. friend take close cognizance of the nature of the Main Estimates? If hon. gentlemen will look through the estimates they will find that so far as new work is concerned, the government both in the Main Estimates and in the supplementaries has resisted to the very limit the demands that are coming from the different constituencies of this country to start any new public works or public buildings. Here and there there are one or two public buildings which have become an absolute necessity and the commencement of which the Minister of Public Works felt he could not possibly longer delay, but looking through the list one will find that practically all the items for public works set forth in these estimates are in the nature of repairs, and looking through the Main Estimates also one will find that practically all the work is in the nature of repairs. May I point out this to my hon. friend? It is not until the spring of the year very often that it becomes possible for the officers of the Department of Public Works to discover what is essential in the nature of repairs. These are largely repairs to wharves and the like. It is the damage done in the winter that necessitates this work. We could let all of that go if hon. members thought it was in the public interest, but it is to save the property belonging to the Dominion that makes it necessary to bring in these estimates. The Public Works estimates so far as the province of Nova Scotia and all the other provinces are concerned are absolutely wanting in anything in the nature of public expenditure for new work. We have I think gone a little too far in that regard. Members of all three groups have pressed the government hard in regard to necessities in particular constituencies in the way of new buildings, and we have steadily refused. So far as these Supplementary Estimates are concerned while the amounts may be a little larger for the repair work and the like than in the Main Estimates it is due to the circumstances I have mentioned. The need for repairs has become more apparent after the winter months, and we refused in the Main Estimates to consider anything in the different constituencies until we had some opportunity of getting further particulars as to these necessities.

In these Supplementary Estimates there are a few amounts occasioned by the legislation that has been passed this session. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance drew attention to the last items brought down to provide for the administration of the Combines Investigation Act. That was inadvertently overlooked. I suppose I am primarily responsible. It was my fault that it was left out of the Main Estimates, and I asked the Minister of Finance to put in a sufficient amount to administer the act which this parliament had assented to.

As to the deputy ministers, I might say a word on that at this moment. There are so far as the increases there mentioned are concerned no general increases in the salaries of the deputy ministers. What the government has done is this. We have ascertained, we have had reason to know, that some of the men who hold these responsible positions in the public service are staying on in the public service to-day resisting offers much more considerable in amount than the salaries they are receiving at the present time.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, well.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I tell my hon. friend it is true.

Mr. HOCKEN: Which one?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I could name several. One of the deputy ministers refused an offer of $20,000 to stay in the service at $10,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will tell my hon. friend if he wishes to know. It was Major Bell, the Deputy Minister of the Department of Railways and Canals. He was offered $20,000 to leave the service and go into other work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He is not on this list.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government found it necessary to give him $10,000 to retain him, and having given him $10,000 with the extra duties he has, the government felt that where there are members of the public service that have been deputy heads of departments for ten years they were entitled to receive an increase to the extent of making their salaries $8,000. That is what is meant by the increases here set forth. Any deputy who has been at the head of a department for ten years or over is named here for an increase in salary. It is not an increase to the office, it is not an increase to the department; it is an increase to the deputy head who has served ten years, simply recognizing the system is general through the Civil Service that length of service be remunerated at perhaps a larger figure. I think if hon. gentlemen opposite will go through these estimates with an eye to the necessity of presenting them in this form at this particular time they will find very little to criticize.

May I add this? Of these estimates brought down at the present time the amount of $5,800,000 is not in the nature of an appropriation for some new work. It is in the nature of a loan. There is one item here of $4,000,000 for loans to provinces for housing advances. Why is that item here? The government in the Main Estimates made it plain to the House that we had felt that previous administrations had made a mistake in voting such large sums of money to the provinces for a number of different purposes to enable the provinces to carry on work which they themselves should carry on. Large sums of money have been voted out of the federal treasury by past administrations for road making, for instance, several millions for aid in agricultural instruction, several millions for aid in technical education, several millions in the form of loans to the provinces for putting up houses in cities and towns. All of this was work which this present government inherited, so to speak, in virtue of the statutes under which these provincial grants were made. They were grants running over a term of years, and if the total of our estimates seems large it is in large part because we have had to carry on from year to year commitments made before we ever came into office at all. We tried to stop certain of these grants from the federal to the provincial treasuries, and among the number we stopped the grants to the provinces for housing loans. We thought it was a mistaken policy on the part of the federal government to be assisting the provinces in the erection of dwellings in cities and towns. Earlier in the session some reference was made to it and I confess I agreed with an hon. gentleman opposite that it would be much better if we were to spend money for the purpose of housing, to spend it on housing for farm dwellers rather than city dwellers. But we discovered that under the plan previously made a number of the provinces had made commitments with the municipalities that had not exhausted their full amounts to advance them sums which they were expecting to get from the federal treasury. and which they became responsible for in the matter of loans paying us interest on them. When we discovered that we were faced with the alternative of having to say to our friends "well, we will have to go back altogether on the undertaking that has been given by the previous government or else make good this amount." That is why this item of $4,000,000 appears in the Supplementary Estimates at the present time. But I have made it plain, in that once the present year is past further advances shall not be continued. I apologize for taking up so much time, but if hon. members will look carefully at the estimates they will see that the government has, if anything, erred on the side of refusing to do in the way of public works throughout this country a great deal that is very much required at the present time.

Mr. HOCKEN: I want to protest against the increases in salary to the deputy ministers.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the three leaders of the respective groups have dealt generally with the estimates. At present we are considering one item for wharf repairs in Nova Scotia, and I think it is only fair to the committee to say that a general discussion is out of order.

Mr. FIELDING: We will reach the vote for the increase in the salaries of deputy ministers shortly.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will defer his remarks on the subject of the increase in the salaries of the deputy ministers until that vote comes up, he will be acting more in accordance with the rules.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the Chair rule that there is to be no answer to the speech of the Prime Minister?

Mr. LAPOINTE: You have made your statement.

Mr. GOULD: Seeing there is an item concerning Nova Scotia under consideration I have made a note in regard to some items in the estimates, and I think the inference which I draw should be placed before the committee and before the country. Undoubtedly during the progress of the discussion upon the various items endeavours will be made to explain what I look upon as an anomaly. I have gone carefully over these estimates and have eliminated the details of civil government, the administration of justice, and so forth. The items I have taken are: Railways and Canals chargeable to income, Public Works chargeable to capital, Public Works chargeable to income, and telegraph and telephone lines. I have segregated these items and I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the figures I have compiled and the inference I draw therefrom.

The CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with a specific item, and I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that while he may be able to deal with some of the items, I question the relevancy of a general discussion of the estimates, main or supplementary, at the present time. It is usual in committee when the Supplementary Estimates are taken up, I am told, for the leaders of the respective groups to deal generally with the estimates as a whole, but I doubt the right of any other member to debate the general question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On the point of order, may I suggest that we have had very little chance of discussion. A great deal of new matter has been brought up by the Prime Minister and I had no opportunity of answering his statements in that regard. I do not think his statements are very important and I am not worrying very much about them. However, may I not avail myself of what I think ought to be my right of reply to the remarks of my hon. friend friend from Assiniboia?

Mr. FIELDING: Then would he have a right to reply to you?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not replying at all.

Mr. GOULD: I wish to comply with your ruling Mr. Chairman.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a question of order to be settled. When we consider the effect of the estimates surely we have a right to take them in bulk. Surely we have a right to consider, having regard to any particular part of the country, the total amount that is going to be expended there bearing in mind the total requirements and the sums that are going to other districts.

The CHAIRMAN: Generally speaking, that discussion should be on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and not on any individual item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure that no one could have got ready for a discussion on a motion to go into Committee of Supply on these estimates. There is this further fact, that we went into committee to-day without a motion. Now, if your ruling be correct, Mr. Chairman, we can have no general discussion on these supplementaries.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend say that now is the time to raise that point?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I certainly say we should have the right to discuss these estimates generally. We would have the right to discuss them on a motion to go into Committee of Supply according to your ruling, but as we went into Committee of Supply to-day without a motion no opportunity has been afforded for such discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me read to the hon. gentleman the rule which is applicable in such a case as this; I refer to paragraph 165, page 42, of Beauchèsne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

> Each grant is a separate motion which must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question, and when it has been formally carried, no reference can be made again thereto. Neither is it regular to discuss any resolution before it has been formally proposed from the chair.

Now, what I am suggesting is this: While there may be, for the purposes of comparison, a reference to certain items, or to an aggregate of items, I feel that I am bound to declare that a general discussion such as the respective leaders have indulged in would not be within the rules for other hon. members.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do not let us have any misunderstanding about the matter. I do not propose to go to that length at all. As I understand it, the object of the member for Assiniboia is to present the totals having regard to specific votes and specific places which he has compiled. Now, let me deal for a moment with the rule which has been read. No doubt there is a certain limitation in regard to particular items, but there is a very broad discretion as to what can be considered in connection with them. For example in

connection with every single item we have a right to consider the manner in which it can be financed, where the money is coming from, the necessities of the country, and the like. In connection with every item we can not only consider the item itself, but the cumulative effect having regard to other items of the same character in the same district.

Mr. GOULD: I do not wish to depart at all from the ruling of the Chair but I desire to present the facts which I have prepared in a manner altogether different from the way they have been advanced before. I think the information I have should be placed before the committee and before the country as well. Under the circumstances I think I should be accorded this privilege if privilege it be. As I stated before, ample opportunity will be afforded to other members to explain what I may term an irregularity or an anomaly. The statement I wish to make will not occupy more than one or two minutes. I was proceeding to enumerate the headings under which I have compiled my figures, and I stated that I had eliminated items from the total which I considered had no bearing upon the case. I may add that I had prepared a more elaborate statement along the same line in connection with the Main Estimates for the purposes of illustration last year, and in previous years, but being a young member my courage failed me when it came to submitting it to the House. However at this late period I have taken my courage in my hand and now wish to make a comparison in connection with the Supplementary Estimates. I wish to assure the committee that my computations for the past have borne out the results which I show here. I have a statement of the per capita return to the provinces out of the expenditures provided for by these supplementary estimates. We find that under the several items the per capita returns are as follows:

	Per capita return
Nova Scotia	$1.25
Ontario	$1.05
Prince Edward Island	.45
British Columbia	$1.05
New Brunswick	.66
Manitoba	.36
Alberta	.09⅜
Saskatchewan	.04½
British Columbia	1.06

It is quite possible that this may be explained, and I think it is due to the committee, and likewise to the country, that we should have a real explanation of this condition. It should likewise be explained whether in the Main Estimates, not only of this year, or last year, but former years, the returns average up according to the illustration which I have just given.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. member state whether he embraced, in his per capita expenditure as regards Alberta and Saskatchewan, the amount which this country is spending in the West for railways; and whether he will find breakwater and wharves that need improvement in Alberta? He might possibly require something to keep the gophers off the land.

Mr. GOULD: I have not taken into consideration any of the items in the Main Estimates yet. I think the hon. member will accept my word that my computation of the Main Estimates will bear out what I have stated.

Mr. WALLACE: I would like to point out that there is a vast difference between the amounts voted for railway construction and the amounts voted for other purposes. In connection with the railways we have the whole debt carried on from year to year and charged to capital account while ordinary expenditures are charged against revenue.

Mr. FIELDING: May I express regret that any hon. member should enter into abstruse calculations regarding per capita expenditures? That is a distinctly provincial view. One province may require one class of work, and another province may require another class. If it can be shown in any province of Canada that there is any deserving public work requiring attention which is not receiving attention, no matter what the per capita shows, it is a just complaint. But if the estimates are devoted to the practical things of a province, one province having wharves and breakwaters and another province having railways, I earnestly implore hon. members not to bring it down to a per capita basis. If there is any public work in any province in Canada deserving of consideration and not receiving it, that will be a just cause of complaint.

Advocate—wharf repairs, $2,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: In this connection I would like to voice my protest against the majority of the items in this vote for Nova Scotia. I believe the proper course for the government would have been to bring these items down in the Main Estimates. It is impossible for any member of the House tonight, without obstructing, to obtain any reasonable figures as regards most of those votes. I may say that 60 per cent of the towns or places mentioned in this vote for Nova Scotia cannot be found

in any geography. They are not there, and as a result there is no means by which we can tell whether we are voting money to be spent in a wilderness or in a town. The first item is for wharf repairs at Advocate. That is one place that is on the map, but in the last 20 years the population of that place decreased from 1,598 to 798, or 50 per cent. The next place mentioned is not on the map. I think it is absolutely unfair that the government should bring down a large vote of this kind so late in the session when we have no reasonable chance to discuss it, unless we obstruct.

Mr. LOGAN: Put these places on the map.

Mr. ARTHURS: The estimates should have been brought down earlier in the session, or the votes included in the Main Estimates.

Mr. PUTNAM: What map does the hon. member refer to?

Mr. ARTHURS: The Gazette of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MILLAR: I am going to ask a question which I have asked before, and to which I have not received a satisfactory answer. If I possibly could get an answer I would like to have it. The government has spent a lot of money in building wharves at very small places. Some of them are very, very small. I know of one case for which $3,500 appears in the estimates. It is only a little place, where nearly all the boats are small craft which are pulled up on the mud flats by men.

Mr. CARROLL: Where is that?

Mr. MILLAR: There are lots of them.

An hon. MEMBER: Ecum Secum.

Mr. MILLAR: If the government follow this policy, I suppose they have some good reason and believe they are right in the course they are pursuing. If they spend money in building wharves at the very small places where there is no national or international trade, why do they not spend money in the same way in other places? Would it be sound policy to spend money in an outlying district where they have no creamery? The only argument I have heard in favour of these expenditures is that if you did not build a wharf you would not have any settlement. There are lots of districts where you would have a settlement if you built a creamery, but you never think of doing it. There are other places where they need an elevator. Why not build one? Is it sound policy? I wish the minister would not side-step. I have put the question and there has been too much side-stepping.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MILLAR: The Minister of Finance has stated that some of us are taking a provincial view of this matter, and he is perfectly right. Looking at the matter broadly, if all the provinces are receiving fair consideration, even though they are not getting it in the shape of wharves but are getting it in some other way, there is no need to complain, provided the policy is a sound one. However, it looks to me as if Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta are not getting their fair share, because they have not places to put wharves. Being young in the House, I have the temerity to ask that the minister should show us how it is a sound policy for the Dominion government to pursue. I can see that it would be more justifiable in the case of a provincial government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) (for Minister of Public Works) My hon. friend is quite right in asking for the fullest information in reference to all the items appearing in the Supplementary Estimates, and I shall be delighted to give him all the information. When we speak about the general question as to whether or not the policy of this or any federal government should be to provide accommodation for the people who make their living by the sea, I say my hon. friend has advanced a novel argument because every government which has been in power since confederation having to do, as we have to do, with trade and commerce, has followed the policy of encouraging the erection of wharves and facilities by which the people who live by the ocean and who have their traffic on the ocean, can pursue their vocation to the best advantage. As the people in the district my hon. friend comes from make their living on the prairies, they should have proper access to the land. The Maritime provinces generally are made up of a class of people, particularly in the southern portion of Nova Scotia, whose business is entirely on the sea. In the county of Lunenburg there is a tremendous fleet of fishing vessels which goes out on the Grand Banks, catches the fish, cures them, and sends them to the Mediterranean and West Indies. These fishermen do not all live in the bigger towns, but they live in the little inland towns and in places where they and their fathers have been accustomed to live. They must have access to the seas for their trade and commerce. I may say that the total expenditure for this year, so far as new works or

repairs in that province are concerned only amounts to $533,000. The past winter was the worst that we have had there for 25 years; there were storms in which wharves and breakwaters were destroyed and conditions created that unless the government followed out the policy of maintaining this means of access to the sea, the result would be that those people who make their living on the ocean, would not have the most ordinary facilities found in every civilized country for doing business. With regard to each one of these items, I would be glad to give my hon. friend the information he desires.

Mr. CHURCH: On what principle is this vote of over half a million dollars for Nova Scotia justified? The people of Ontario see the Maritime provinces getting everything on a plea of lack of transportation facilities. On what principle are these votes for harbours made, for example? Canada never had a definite programme as regards improvement of harbours, or canal improvements. Money has been spent on some canals when it should not have been spent, and in other instances, money has not been spent when it should have been spent. It seems that all of a sudden the walls of old wharves in the Maritime provinces fall down. I understand that the policy of the government is economy. I did not see in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of parliament, any statement referring to Supplementary Estimates of fifteen or sixteen million dollars. Every country in the world to-day is reducing its capital debt. France, the United States, England, are reducing their capital debts and also their maintenance charges. In Canada we have a very heavy debt. This year, $73,000,000 for railways must come out of the taxpayers of this country, and the taxpayers have to pay huge sums to maintain the public services of the Dominion. In my opinion, these improvements in the Maritime provinces to breakwaters, wharves and other public works are unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that a specific item which has been called from the Chair is being dealt with, and a general debate is not in order upon it.

Mr. CHURCH: I was debating item No. 504, in connection with the Maritime provinces.

The CHAIRMAN: By agreement of the committee, we are debating the first item of vote No. 504. We are taking up each work as it appears in the list.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. CHURCH: I am discussing the principle of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN: It is too late to discuss the principle at this particular time.

Mr. CHURCH: The government is proposing a great deal of expenditure that, in my opinion, is not necessary. I do not think these are public works within the meaning of the British North America Act. In the United States, this class of work is done under the local improvement system, by which as regards a harbour or a depot port, there must be some revenue from that port to meet the expenditures. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) is not here.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have to ask the committee a little later on to vote some $600,000 for some harbour improvements in Toronto. I wonder if my hon. friend will be as economical when that item is under discussion.

Mr. CHURCH: How much revenue is derived from these wharves throughout the country?

Mr. HANSON: How many of these 68 items are in the constituency of Cape Breton North and Victoria, and what is the aggregate amount for items in that particular constituency?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If my hon. friend will keep track of them as we go along, he can add them up himself, because I never attempted to add them up.

Mr. HANSON: The hon. gentleman should tell me how many are in that constituency.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will tell my hon. friend as we go along.

Mr. HANSON: Point them out as we go along.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I desire to give my hon. friend the pleasure that he so earnestly asked for a few minutes ago, of having an opportunity to give us full details on this appropriation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This work is required for the purpose of re-topping 135 feet in length of the wharf, with occasional renewals over the whole work, including a large portion of the sheathing. This is the only wharf in the locality situated 33 miles from a railway. About 400,000 lineal feet of piling, 2,000,000 feet of lumber and farm produce valued at $15,000 is shipped from this wharf annually, and general supplies for the locality are landed there. The Department of Marine and Fisheries in letters of

February 28, 1923, and January 31, 1923, state that "Advice has been received that a great deal of the sheathing of the public wharf at Advocate harbour, N. S., is loose and will be carried away by ice in the spring unless something is done to save it." The wharf was constructed in 1899-90. No departmental works are in the immediate vicinity. The nearest public wharf is the breakwater at West Advocate, about 3 miles west of this wharf.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What county is it in?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Cumberland county.

Item agreed to.

Abbott's harbour—breakwater extension, $1,350.

Mr. CHURCH: How many ships of the Merchant Marine have come into Abbott's harbour in the last year?

Mr. HOCKEN: What is the geographical location of this harbour?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is situated in Yarmouth county. It is proposed to construct a cribwork extension 50 feet long and 12 feet wide to the existing breakwater. This is one of the fishing villages of which I spoke a few minutes ago, where the fishing business on the Atlantic is carried on by the people who live in the vicinity. The wharf is their only convenience.

9 p.m.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Do the local people take any part in the repairs to these breakwaters? In Ontario, along the lakes, where a breakwater is established, it is paid for by the municipality.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am informed by the official here that my hon. friend from Kingston is hardly accurate about that. In our province, where we require to protect low-lying settlements by a system of dykes, those are carried on under provincial authority, but works along the lakes are carried out by the Dominion authorities.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am asking about breakwaters. There is no question about protecting low-lying land in Ontario. That work is undertaken by the provincial legislature, but in Ontario a local breakwater is usually paid for by the municipality.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No. My hon. friend will find, if he looks at the estimates, that there are appropriations for breakwaters in his province.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There is one in Kingston, but it is the military college.

Mr. LOGAN: If the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates he will find a certain amount provided for "Repairs to drydock at Kingston, Ontario."

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That *is* government property.

Mr LOGAN: That is government property too.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The drydock is for the protection of government property.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend has not studied the Estimates. On page 11 he will find two items for Ontario.

Mr. CHURCH: What is the necessity of this item for breakwater extension at Abbott's Harbour? It could well have been included in the Main Estimates. Why sell the Canadian Government Merchant Marine if this harbour is to be kept up?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHURCH: I should like an answer to my question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend's question was answered some time ago in replying to other hon. gentlemen. I am sorry he did not hear the answer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What county is this in?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Queen's and Shelburne.

Item agreed to.

Bass river—improvements, $1,500.

Mr. HANSON: What county?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Colchester.

Item agreed to.

Battery point—breakwater extension, $9,600.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What county?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Annapolis.

Sir HENRY DAYTON: This looks like another new item. I understood from the general remarks of the Prime Minister that there were to be no new works at all, only repairs. An extension is a new work. Why is the Prime Minister's rule being departed from here?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend should not be querulous about this item. When he was minister in 1920 his friends pro-

posed to make an extension to the breakwater —which is nothing more or less than building an addition to it to better protect access to the harbour—and in 1920 my hon. friend's Minister of Public Works asked for tenders for a proposed expenditure of $12,000 or $14,000. There is no new work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: An extension is new work.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend must know that an extension of a breakwater is not new work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is putting on new work for extending an old one. We might as well be frank and honest with each other.

Item agreed to.

Broad Cove marsh—replacement breakwater-wharf, $8,400.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in Inverness county.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the engineer's report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This vote is for the construction of a cribwork wharf, 200 feet long and 28 feet wide, to replace the existing structure, which is in a dilapidated condition through storms.

Item agreed to.

Burlington Centre—wharf extension, $7,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What county?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Hants.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What justification could there be for any new work in Hants?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is a cribwork extension to a public wharf, 20 feet by 50 feet. The extension is asked for to give more room at this wharf for shipping.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would feel more comfortable about this vote if it were supported by the eloquent member for Hants (Mr. Hanson).

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You want to hear speeches, not to pass votes.

Mr. GOULD: Is the work to be carried on by public contract, or is the money to be given to individuals or municipalities to look after the work?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Tenders will be called for and the work let to the highest tender—I mean the lowest.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Canada creek—rebuilding shore end of breakwater, $1,300.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is this?

Mr MACDONALD (Pictou): Canada creek is in King's county.

Item agreed to.

Cariboo island—breakwater reconstruction, $6,000.

Mr. HANSON: Where is Cariboo island?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In the county of Pictou.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is going to be done with the wharf?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is not a wharf. This work is to raise the level of the breakwater from two to three feet for a length of fourteen feet and a width of sixteen feet. The storms of last autumn and winter practically destroyed this breakwater.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this to be done by day labour, contract or what?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): By contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Have any advertisements been issued?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, we do not ask for contracts until the House permits the money to be expended.

Mr. BOYS: I see there are no less than sixty-eight of these items for Nova Scotia. Are there any wharves whatever in the whole province that are not being either extended or repaired. If so, I should like to know where they are.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am afraid my genial friend from South Simcoe has not visited our province or he would realize that it is an island.

Mr. BOYS: I know it is an island. I do not want a geographical description. I asked the minister: Are there any wharves in the whole province that are not being either extended or repaired? I should like an answer.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant to this particular item.

Mr. BOYS: I submit it is, Mr. Chairman.

M. MACDONALD (Pictou): My officer informs me that we have no data to indicate the total number of wharves in Nova Scotia. If my hon. friend is really sincere, I will get the information and give it to him tomorrow.

Mr. BOYS: I am sincere, for certain reasons. I do not want to be too critical of the acting minister, but I made a most modest

request—I do not know whether this is in order or not, but it seems an appropriate place to refer to it—for a very small expenditure in connection with a government proposition, and could not get $6,000 for it; yet here are sixty-eight items in one single province involving an expenditure of over half a million dollars. In the face of this we are told that Canada has not enough money to build a decent road over which expensive government trucks attached to Camp Borden are being damaged daily. The road is nothing but an Indian trail. I am not speaking for my riding or politically, I am speaking for something that is absolutely essential for the ordinary user of Camp Borden. This road is used by thousands of people every year. Camp Borden is a wonderful camp, and I trust it will be kept up. But what startles me is that we find this tremendous number of items here for one province, while we cannot get $5,000 to improve a government property in another province in order that damage which is now daily done to trucks owned by this government may be avoided. I do not blame the acting minister; it is true this has not been pressed upon him for very long. But it has been pressed for a long time upon others; and it does arouse my interest when I see these sums of money being voted here—$5,000 or $6,000, $40,000, $50,000 when we cannot get the small amount required for this much needed work. I am not asking the acting minister to expend a large sum of money; I merely ask for an ordinary gravelled road so that the people using this camp can get in and out and so that the trucks can be used without being seriously damaged. I do think the government should give some attention to a matter of this kind; we should not be called upon to vote huge sums in certain provinces while a small but important work of this kind is ignored. Is every wharf in Nova Scotia receiving attention? I know that Nova Scotia is represented by sixteen Liberals; they are all first-class fellows as far as I know them and I do not blame them for asking for what they think they are entitled to. Personally I should be prepared to support what they are entitled to, but I do not want to support that while the needs of other parts of Canada are passed over.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I think my hon. friend is hardly fair in the position he has taken. During the war these wharves and breakwaters in the Maritime provinces were neglected owing to the demands made by war necessities; hence it is that attention must be given to them now. Moreover, last winter was the worst we have had for a quarter of a century, and the injury to these harbours and wharves was very great. As to the road to Borden, the committee will recall that there has not been much disposition these last two years to be very liberal in expenditures connected with national defence or the militia, and the amount of funds at the disposal of that department is not very great. I know that my hon. friend called my attention not more than two weeks ago to the necessity of having improvements made on that road to Borden.

Mr. BOYS: I called the attention of my hon. friend's predecessor to it as well. I have said that I am not blaming the acting minister; nevertheless the records ought to be in his department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): When my hon. friend called my attention to the condition of this road I made inquiries from the officers of the department, who reported that there was good ground for the complaint made, but that a large vote would be necessary to give the matter proper attention. I gave instructions that the matter be looked into fully and that plans be prepared for submission next year so that we might consider the question of asking parliament then to provide something for that purpose.

Mr. BOYS: I want to say right here and now that this business of getting extensive plans is a farce. During this recent campaign I travelled on a road, for instance, in the county of Grey from Meaford to Clarksburg, a first class gravelled road, about twenty-two feet wide, on which a motor car can travel fifty miles an hour with safety. That road cost $8,000 a mile. The road to which I have been referring is a mile and a quarter or a mile and a half long. The matter was brought to the attention of the previous minister, not by myself, but by one of the most enthusiastic Liberals in the county of Simcoe. If the country has so much money to spend as is indicated by these Supplementary Estimates, I do not see why we cannot get a work of this kind done. You do not need plans for it at all. It is nothing but an Indian trail at present; all you have to do is to grade the road and put some gravel on it so as to make it fit for travel. In its present condition it is utterly unfit for travel. I say that if these huge sums are to be voted so freely; some expenditure might well be made on the road of which I speak. I ask the minister, are there any wharves at all in the whole of Nova Scotia that are not being either repaired or extended? I shall be pleased to have that information.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend ought not to assume that attitude. I can tell him that there are hundreds of wharves in Nova Scotia that are not being repaired or extended.

Mr. BOYS: Is my hon. friend serious in that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am serious.

Mr. BOYS: Hundreds of wharves?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Surely.

Mr. BOYS: The minister will give me the information?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will get the information.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is exercised over the fact that there is certain work in his district that has not been done.

Mr. BOYS: I am; I admit it.

Mr. BELAND: That is probably right, but I would point out that in 1920, when the party he supports was in power, the same item for harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia, No. 490, contained fifty-five items for wharf repairs and extensions and piers. Most of them are not mentioned in this one.

Mr. BOYS: Then if there were 55 in 1920, there is no earthly reason for having 68 now.

Mr. CHURCH: I suggest that the minister should read the report of the Deputy Minister of Public Works regarding the necessity for this work, because in all expenditures of this kind the report of an engineer is furnished as to the utility of the work, and so on. What do the Progressives think of an expenditure like this? The Progressives were elected on a policy of economy and retrenchment.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he must deal specifically with the item under consideration.

Mr. CHURCH: I think it is quite relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant; the hon. gentleman must deal specifically with the item.

Mr. CHURCH: This work is not a work for the general advantage of Canada. I would like the minister to give the figures of the expenditure on this harbour for the past fifteen years. It is my opinion that the work is not necessary at all. In view of the large deficits on our National Railways; in view of the heavy debt under which Canada labours, there must be retrenchment. England the United States, France—all these countries are trying to live within their income. I would like some information about this item. Is this expenditure to be a capital charge or a maintenance charge, and is the money to come out of revenue?

Mr. GOULD: This vote involves an expenditure of $533,884.60, and the greater part of it is for the repairing of wharves and breakwaters. A few moments ago I asked the minister if the tenders had been received for these works, and he replied in the affirmative. It occurs to me that as this is a hardy annual and as the province of Nova Scotia has grown old in the receipt of these payments, it would be a good business proposition if the government would have a small crew with equipment to go round this island or peninsula and complete the work. That might result in a material saving from year to year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In the Main Estimates the items for harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, totalled $293,000. Evidently those estimates were prepared when the present Minister of Railways was in the office, and since the new minister has come in he has brought down Supplementary Estimates amounting to over $533,000. If this is the spirit of the new minister coming in I think probably we were wrong in getting a new minister. We might as well have left the old one there.

Mr. BAXTER: I understand that the item that we have not passed yet is this Canada Creek.

The CHAIRMAN: That is passed.

Mr. BAXTER: It is not passed. I have been trying to speak for the last fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: The Canada Creek item is passed.

Mr. BAXTER: I have been trying to speak to it for the last fifteen minutes. If it is passed I am going to refer to it just the same, and for this purpose. I heard the minister giving some figures. I have heard him imperfectly as the House has not been as quiet as it might have been, but I rather gathered from the quantity of material that was mentioned that the sum of money was not likely to accomplish the work. Now I want to ask the minister a general question in regard to all these items because I think we might just as well have it clearly in the minds of the committee now as item by item. I would ask the minister to distinguish in each instance between the amounts that will com-

plete the whole work and the amounts that will only partially complete it. In other words I want to know, and I think the committee would like to know whether these amounts embrace everything that is to be done or is it only to cover a part of the work. The minister will recognize that it is a perfectly fair question to ask, and if that principle is applied right through by the minister I think we shall save time.

I am not going to criticize particular items because being fortunate enough to come from the Maritime provinces I know the extreme necessity there is there for a great deal of work, and it would not hurt the Dominion very much if perhaps the suggestion of the hon. member were taken and we had a sort of wharf built all around some of our provinces if we could induce the other provinces to make use of our Maritime provinces in the way we would like to be able to do. We still like to feel we are a part of Canada. We do not want to be the only part of Canada, but we do not propose to be excluded from confederation even by some of our too zealous allies. The only criticism I have to make is this, and it reflects on the Department of Public Works, it shows gross carelessness to my mind: There is no reason in the world, despite a hard winter and all that sort of thing, why these items should not have been in the Main Estimates. The information that was available for the Main Estimates was of precisely the same class as we are getting on the supplementaries, and it shows a want of grip in the department that the acting minister is not responsible for but that someone is responsible for, that the House should have to be asking these questions at this hour when these matters might just as well have been dealt with in the Main Estimates.

Mr. HANSON: I understand the hon. member for St. John to ask the acting minister to state in every case whether the amount mentioned in the estimates was the total amount required to complete the work, or whether it was simply a partial vote and the item would come back to us another year in this or some other form. That is a practice that has been quite common in the last few years.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I shall be very glad to give the information. The engineer's report in regard to Canada Creek is to the effect that $1,300 is ample to complete the work.

Mr. BAXTER: May I trouble the minister to repeat the dimensions of that work? I might not have heard him correctly, but if the figures were as I understood them $1,300 would not do it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The proposed work consists of tearing down and rebuilding a portion of the breakwater, 40 feet long, 10 feet wide and 21 feet high. In regard to Cariboo Island $6,000 is stated by the engineers to be ample for the purpose of completing the work.

Item agreed to.

Cheverie—wharf repairs, $1,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Hants county.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this sufficient to cover the whole work?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Item ageed to.

Colloden—breakwater extension, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. FIELDING: Digby county.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does my hon. friend say as to the sufficiency of the estimate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The estimated cost of this work is $15,000. The amount of $5,000 is asked for to provide for the construction of a crib and extension, 100 feet long and 30 feet wide, to the existing breakwater.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is only a partial vote? I understood my hon. friend to say the total cost would be $15,000. I thought my hon. friend was going to distinguish between the items that would be completed for the amounts stated here and the partial votes, as suggested by my hon. friend from St. John.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I gave no general answer. I said I could give the answer in each particular case.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then what is the necessity for going on with this work that is going to cost $15,000 ultimately?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question. I do not know whether I have to stand all the time for the answer. We find that this is really a $15,000 item instead of a $5,000 item, because this $5,000 is merely going to start the work, and I venture to ask what was the evidence as to the necessity.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The necessity for this work was reported on by the district engineer. It was asked for by a very largely signed petition containing 215 signatures. It is claimed that the present breakwater is too short to afford the protection required.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the population of this place?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In addition to the fishing village itself, in which there are about fifty families, this breakwater serves the whole settlement and district around. There are many people scattered along the shore.

Item agreed to.

D'Escousse—wharf repairs, $3,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We want to know the county in each case.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): South Cape Breton.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And whether this is the final estimate or only a partial vote in each case.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is to complete.

Item agreed to.

Dartmouth—pier and dredging, $75,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of a repair job is this?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend has misread the item I think.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I was remembering the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said most of them. I did not say all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Dartmouth is a very prosperous town with a population of between six and seven thousand. It is situated right across from the city of Halifax. This is new work. There is no wharf accommodation at Dartmouth and has not been. Some years ago my hon. friend's friends constructed a railway running from Dartmouth to the eastern part of Nova Scotia, and through that railway there has been brought to Dartmouth very large quantities of lumber. The opening up of the district has resulted in great development. The necessity of the work has been vouched for by the people of Halifax county generally and has been favourably reported upon by the engineers. I am satisfied my hon. friends will not make the slightest mistake in supporting it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend is right about that vote.

Mr. CHURCH: Does the Prime Minister approve of this extravagance? In the case of all works calling for an expenditure of over $3,000 will tenders be called for, and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer after fair competition in the open market? Does the Prime Minister approve of this extravagant expenditure on wharves in harbours where there is no business, and where the government derives no revenue? I think I could better justify an expenditure to enable vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine to carry coal from Nova Scotia to Montreal for consumption in central Ontario where it is needed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my hon. friend asking me a question or making a speech?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Both.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In answer to what I gather to be my hon. friend's question I wish to say that the statutes provide—in the case of public works, where the amount to be expended exceeds a certain sum—that public tenders must be called for. Other conditions are also set forth. The provisions of the law in this respect will be fully complied with. I may say further that any public works for which the government asks an appropriation are required in the public interest.

Item agreed to.

Digby—dredging, $15,100.

Mr. HANSON: What part of Digby harbour is it proposed to dredge; also, how much money has been spent in dredging in that harbour in the last five years?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou), I will give the information we have. The purpose of this work is to deepen the berth between the two piers so that steamers with a loaded draught of twenty-four feet can load at low water, ordinary spring tides. The area to be dredged is 53,000 square feet. A report on the necessity of this work was made by the regular

district engineer. Digby is a very important place in the province. It is on the bay of Fundy as my hon. friend knows very well.

Hr. HANSON: Is there a government pier at Digby?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Was there not a vote in the main estimates for dredging at Digby? I think there was a vote of some kind.

Item agreed to.

Eastern Harbour—improvements, $38,000.

Mr. HANSON: Where is Eastern Harbour?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Eastern Harbour is in Inverness county.

Mr. HANSON: This is a large expenditure, and, I take it, a new one. What is the nature of the expenditures, and how many people live in Eastern Harbour?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say—

Mr. HANSON: I was addressing my question to the minister. He has his memoranda before him and can answer the question.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I think, possibly, if my hon. friend will grant me the courtesy of allowing me to speak occasionally, I do not take up as much time of the House as my hon. friend does. Let me tell him that he is not going to get me to sit down in the House when I am in order. This expenditure is for dredging Eastern Harbour which is surrounded by a population of five hundred families. There is a large gypsum deposit there and a new industry has been started. A very substantial amount has been spent in erecting a gypsum plant which was closed down during the war. Capital is once more being invested in the industry which is to be operated on a large scale. At present gypsum cannot be shipped from Eastern Harbour until some dredging has been done. Unfortunately we are about fifty miles from a railway. The harbour is a very good one, but there is not enough water at present for ships to come in and load in connection with this industry. For fishing and such like needs the depth of water is sufficient. For the purposes of the gypsum industry larger vessels, having a draught of between twenty and twenty-one feet are necessary. That is the object of this dredging. Were it not for this new industry I would not press the department for this vote.

Mr. HANSON: I should like to say that I meant no intentional discourtesy to the hon. member. I asked the minister a very courteous question in a very polite way. I do not think there was any necessity for a threat from the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm). He has taken as a personal affront a purely harmless question. Now, I asked the minister for a statement and perhaps we had better have it now.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend asked how many people there were in that vicinity, and I thought the representative for the county was in a better position to give him the information.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Can the minister tell us how it happens there are dredging items here, whereas in the main estimates a blank cheque for $600,000 was given to the Maritime provinces for dredging? How is it that the department is not using its own dredges on this work?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The general vote for dredging in the main estimates is for the purpose of operating the dredges which belong to the government. They have to be used continuously in certain portions of the Maritime provinces for maintaining access to the harbours. These special votes are for dredging to be done by private parties. Tenders will be asked for and contracts awarded for the work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister tell us what we are spending the $600,000 on so that we can be sure there is no overlapping here.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am informed by the deputy minister that that information was given earlier in the session when the main items were under consideration.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am asking for the information now so as to be sure that we are not voting the same expenditure twice.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): We are not asking for money for the same purpose twice as my hon. friend knows very well.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No I do not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am instructed by the deputy minister that when the vote in the Main Estimates was passed complete information was given to the House as to the number of dredges and everything connected with them. This work is not intended to be done by government dredges but by contract after calling for tenders.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I again ask my hon. friend what dredging the government dredges are doing? Why cannot they be employed on this work?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will be very glad to give my hon. friend that information in detail to-morrow.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let the item stand until we get the information.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That will be a matter for the committee entirely. I have asked a perfectly pertinent question and I have not yet received the information.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend does not apprehend what I say. These votes are for the purpose of dredging other than by government dredges. I shall be glad to give my hon. friend full information to-morrow as to where the government dredges are, the work they are doing, and so forth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should have thought that that information would be given before we were called upon to vote the item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That was all explained on the main estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That cannot be so, because at the time on the main estimates we were not discussing this item, and we were not endeavouring to ascertain whether this dredging could be done by the government dredges.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me that in a town so close to the main centres as Digby or Dartmouth our own dredges should be able to do the work instead of the government hiring dredges from private individuals. Dartmouth is right inside the Halifax harbour.

Mr. FIELDING: If the government dredge is already employed how can it do the work? The minister has explained that the government dredges were covered by the earlier vote but the amount of dredging is far in excess of what the government dredges should do, and therefore private contracts are made.

Mr. HANSON: I think certain friends of the government in that district own dredges and have been looking for work. They have always been looking for work, and have always received it from this government.

Mr. FIELDING: I think there are more private dredges seeking work in the city of St. John than in the city of Halifax.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) should not be so ungenerous. I am in a position to state that one of the difficulties in carrying out these works is to find dredge owners in Nova Scotia who are willing to tender for the work.

Mr. HANSON: The minister should ask some of his friends in St. John to tender.

Item agreed to.

East Sandy Cove—wharf, $9,350.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is this?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Digby and Annapolis.

Mr. BAXTER: Is this the whole estimate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of repair job is it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is to construct a cribwork approach 100 feet long by 25 feet wide, and a pilework wharf 100 feet long and 25 feet wide including a head 40 feet by 30 feet. This place is a port of call for a small steamer and the present wharf is inadequate. The value of freight landed annually is from $20,000 to $25,000. The value of fish, fresh and salt, annually shipped amounts to about $10,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the population?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Seven hundred.

Mr. HANSON: Did the engineer report in favour of it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: When did he make the report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In the spring of the year.

Mr. BOYS: In the spring, or in January.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not the exact date. It was since the main estimate was brought down. I will get the date.

Mr. BOYS: Are all these items supported by reports from the engineers, and were all reports made subsequent to the introduction of the main estimates?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not all.

Mr. HANSON: How many were made subsequent to the main estimates?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not know.

Mr. HANSON: The deputy minister could give the information. Is Sandy Cove the summer resort just east of Digby on the main shore, and does the minister say there are 700 people at Sandy Cove? There might be one or two days in the summer time when there would be that many people there, but they would not be there the year around.

Mr. SPENCE: I think according to the census, there is no population there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is not a good authority in that regard, at least not as good as the engineer of the department because the engineer says the returns from the census of 1921 showed 685 people.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have a serious question with reference to the accuracy of all these engineers' reports. Here is the government's census return showing no population and the engineer's report giving a population of 600 odd. I wonder whether the hon. member has the right address down there.

Mr. CAHILL: Has my hon. friend the right address?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we will have to rely on the census, because it has been published by the government.

Mr. LOVETT: I am very well acquainted with that district. It is in my constituency. The engineer's report is quite correct. That district serves a large part of the country outside.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. LOVETT: Digby Neck.

An hon. MEMBER: It may have a boil.

Mr. SPENCE: I think the minister ought to get the name changed.

Ecum Secum—completing wharf and building road, $6,100.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We were to get the dates of these reports. The minister said he would let us have the dates as we went along, and he would let us know whether it was a full or partial statement.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will be glad to do so, but the hon. member is talking all the time and I have no chance. This is in the county of Halifax and the engineer's report was made last winter. I have not the exact date. Two reports were made upon that, one in March, 1922, but I have not the date of the report last winter. The necessity of this work is as follows:

District Engineer Dodwell reported that the proposed work was necessary to complete the wharf which has settled to a greater extent than was expected from the time it commenced in 1913 until it was recommenced in 1920. Owing to the lateness of the season when labour and material could not be procured it was found impossible to complete the work in 1920.

Again, my hon. friend started out to do the work when he was in power.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this the final estimate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Five Islands—wharf extension, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is this?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in the county of Colchester. This is the amount expected to be necessary to complete the work as requested by the district engineer, Mr. Dodwell, in estimates of 1922-23.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many people are there?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The number of people is 524. It is a very good district in the county of Colchester and very well known in the province.

Item agreed to.

Fruid's Point—wharf repairs, $4,900.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is in the county of Shelburne. The amount proposed will complete the work and it was reported upon, November 23, 1922, by the engineer.

Mr. HANSON: Why was it not included in the Main Estimate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question was as to whether or not it should be dealt with by the Department of Railways and Canals or by the Public Works department.

Mr. HANSON: Why the Department of Railways? Why should there be any question about it? Is there a railway there now?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The railway runs along the southern shore.

Item agreed to.

Gillis Point—wharf repairs, $1,100.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in the county of Victoria. These are ordinary repairs to the wharf which are recommended by the engineer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend would remember the particulars we want, I would not have to repeat my question so often. My hon. friend has not told us whether this is a complete estimate or not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is.

Item agreed to.

Grand Narrows—wharf extension, $2,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is also in the county of Cape Breton North and Victoria. It was reported on by the engineer. This is to construct pile work extension to the wharf. The amount voted is expected to complete the work.

Mr. SPENCE: I should be glad if the acting minister would speak a little louder. Hon. members on this side who are interested in these matters cannot hear what is said.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the members of the committee to cease the conversation that is going on in the chamber. It is very difficult sometimes to hear even here.

Item agreed to.

Half Island Cove—rebuilding breakwater—further amount required, $1,650.

Mr. SPENCE: Is this on the Atlantic coast or not, or does it go into a private home? We do not seem to be able to get any information on these items. These breakwaters and wharves seem to be about every hundred yards. These places are summer resorts pure and simple. In the census of 1921, more than nine-tenths of the whole of them are not mentioned at all, having no population. This is simply buying a vote here and a vote there.

An hon. MEMBER: If there is no population, how can you buy a vote?

Mr. McISAAC: For the benefit of the hon. gentleman from Toronto, who, like another colleague of his, either never went to school, or never studied geography, I want to tell him that Half Island Cove is a very important seaport on the Atlantic ocean, 20 miles east of Guysborough. It is a very important fishing district.

Mr. SPENCE: Do many boats come in there?

Mr. McISAAC: Yes, a packet calls there three or four times a week, and there is quite a fleet of fishing boats and schooners there. The quantity of fish shipped from there yearly is very large. If my hon. friend along with other Ontario members would take advantage of their passes over the Canadian National Railways and visit the Maritime provinces, some light would be shed on them, and they would not make such an exhibition of themselves in this House. Millions of Money are expended on Toronto harbour every year, and they think it is the only place on earth. Some people go bathing in that harbour, and I pity the people who have to bathe in the muddy water of Toronto harbour. If they would visit the Maritime provinces and give themselves some nice, clean bathing in the salt water on the coast of Nova Scotia, they would have a more intelligent understanding of public questions, and they would be better physically and intellectually.

Item agreed to.

Hampton—breakwater repairs, $8,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder whether we could not have another statement from the hon. member on this item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This work is in Digby county. It is to rebuild a crib work 80 feet long, 30 feet wide, and 22 feet high. The amount proposed will complete the work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of the report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): April 23, 1923.

Item agreed to.

Inverness—repairs to piers, $4,400.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This will complete the work; it is to close-pile 120 feet of the channel face of the east pier and construct 150 feet of the sea-wall—to complete the improvements commenced in 1922-23. This is not a new work.

Item agreed to.

Little Anse—in full and final settlement of T. D. Morrison's claim in connection with contract for construction of a breakwater, $3,234.60.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister give us the report in connection with this work?

Mr. MACDONAID (Pictou): On May 31, 1911 a contract was let to Mr. T. D. Morrison for the construction of a breakwater at Little Anse, for the sum of $21,500. The work was completed and the final estimate paid—$21,800, but while the work was in progress—on December 27 and 28, 1912,—a gale which attained a maximum velocity of 53 miles an hour destroyed the outer 70 feet in length of the uncompleted structure to a depth of 10 feet and emptied the ballast out of a further length of 160 feet of the breakwater

to practically low water mark. The contractor put in a claim of $3,500 for additional work rendered necessary by the damage done by the storm.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When was that claim put in?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Last year—I am informed by the deputy that it was made some time before that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When was the work done?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In 1912-13.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the date of the storm?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): December 27-28, 1912. The claim was referred to the district engineer who, after careful and thorough review of the circumstances, stated that the contractor was fairly and properly entitled to be paid the amount of damages claimed.

The following is the value of the work of reconstruction for which the contractor claims conpensation:

15,120 cu. ft. cribwork at 8c per cu. ft...	$1,209.60
Extra material in partially damaged 160 ft. ..	325.00
850 yds. ballast replaced at $2.00	1,700.00
	$3,234.60

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was that a lump contract or a quantity contract, or what?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The information I have at hand indicates that the contract was let for $21,500, but the deputy informs me that he is unable to say at the moment whether or not it was for a lump sum, or a quantity contract.

Mr. HANSON: Is this a compassionate allowance to a man who lost money through an act of God, or is there a legal liability to pay his claim? Let us have the truth in regard to this matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I, of course, acting in the absence of the minister who has unfortunately had to go to his province to attend an engagement, am speaking without personal knowledge of these matters, and am giving the information which comes to me through the officers. I am informed that this has been a frequent practice followed by all governments, where there was a contract and work was destroyed under unfortunate circumstances as a result of the elements. This case is an ordinary one, and the claim has been recommended by the engineer.

10 p.m.

Mr. CHAPLIN: When was the claim first made on the department?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Immediately after the completion of the work, at the time when the storm occurred and the necessity for the additional work arose.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I presume the engineer of that time must have made some report on this matter. This is 11 years ago. What report was made at the time by the engineer in respect of this claim?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I would fancy myself, for the information of my hon. friend, it was because Mr. Morrison, this gentleman who happened to have this contract, was a Liberal and my hon. friend and his friends who came into power in 1911, did not want to recognize a claim which was perfectly legal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that is the only suggestion my hon. friend has to make, there is another suggestion which would be much more in point at the present time; that is, that because Mr. Morrison is a Liberal, and probably a Liberal worker, this government is going round resurrecting an outlawed claim. My hon. friend has no right to make that statement in connection with his engineers. Has he no trust in the honesty of the engineers of the department? Does he insinuate that the engineer then in charge made a false report because this man was alleged to be a Liberal? Surely my hon. friend is not serious.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is the matter with my hon. friend? I told him that the information here disclosed that this matter was dealt with on the report of the engineer of the department. My hon. friend seems to have forgotten.

Mr. BOYS: What was the report of the engineer when this claim was presented? Why was it not paid?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): After a careful and thorough review of the circumstances the engineer thought the contractor was fairly and properly entitled to be paid.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of this report? Mr. Chairman, in a case of this kind the least the committee is entitled to is production of all the papers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What does my hon. friend want?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The file.

Mr. BOYS: We want the report that was made when this was a living claim. As I understand, the contract was let in 1911.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): On May 31st, 1911.

Mr. BOYS: I take it for granted that the contractor made his claim, if not in the latter part of that year, at least in the early part of the following year. I presume the claim was investigated and that the engineer made a report on it. I go further. I take it for granted that the present minister, before he would resurrect an outlawed claim more than ten years old, would investigate and find out what the report of the engineer was. Before we are asked to deal with a matter that is now twelve years old, I think we ought to know exactly what was reported at the time, and why the claim was not paid.

Mr. KYTE: This work was performed in the county of Cape Breton South and Richmond. During its progress a storm of unprecedented severity occurred along the coast and a great deal of property was destroyed. As a matter of fact buildings were washed off the wharves and along the waterfront. The oldest records in the community recount no such high tide or so severe a windstorm as on that occasion. Mr. Morrison had his work well under way when the storm overtook it. As a result he suffered very substantial loss. It has not been an unusual practice of the Public Works department under both governments to come to the assistance of a contractor who while carrying on work under his contract suffered loss under these circumstances. As to the politics of the contractor, I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, if the matter is of any interest, that he was not a supporter of mine nor a worker at all in the last election. He came to me, however, after I was elected, being a resident of my county. I felt that he had a strong claim to be recompensed for his loss, otherwise he would be in very serious financial difficulties. I beg to assure hon. members that the claim is one which merits the favourable consideration of the committee, and that it is not presented on account of political considerations.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend was a member of this House from 1911 to 1917. I presume he knew of this claim during that period?

Mr. KYTE: I knew—

Mr. BOYS: Just one minute until I put my question. I would not have anything ruffle the most delightful relations that have existed between my hon. friend and myself during this session. I would ask him whether or not during that period of six years he investigated this claim and pressed it upon the former minister? If he did, was there an engineer's report in favour of it? And if so, why was the claim not recognized during the years I have referred to?

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Morrison did not consult me in regard to his claim; he went to other sources of support. I think he did consult the gentleman who was my political opponent in the election of 1911, but he never came to me or gave me any information in regard to it until the last two years.

Mr. BOYS: Then did my hon. friend himself investigate this claim and ascertain whether or not there had been an engineer's report favourable to it? Or did he simply, as it were, "go it blind," desiring to be kindly when the matter was pressed upon him? If my hon. friend cannot answer that, then I think we must once more turn to the acting minister and ask him for this information. Surely it is not proper for the committee to pass a claim that is absolutely outlawed. I am not suggesting that the government should plead the Statute of Limitations; surely that would never be done to defeat a righteous claim. But the committee is entitled to this information now, and we have not got any from the acting minister or from my hon. friend who is more or less familiar and sympathetic with the matter.

Mr. KYTE: I have no information with regard to any report. All I did was to ascertain the correctness of the claim with respect to the severe storm. I did investigate that and I furnished the information to the department within the last year. I know nothing about any further report.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Chairman, the minister has enunciated a principle which, to me at all events, is brand new: That when a contractor enters into a contract with the government and assumes the ordinary risk under it, if by any fortuitous circumstance, whether by act of God or anything of that sort, he loses money, he can then come back to the government for compensation, and that it has been the practice of all governments in days gone by to make good such losses. That is not the practice of the government in the other departments. It certainly is not the practice of the Railway department with contractors who have built bridges and substructures of bridges, I can assure the committee. If that be the practice of the Public Works department, there must have been a

report adverse to the payment of this claim, and I ask the minister in all fairness to give us the full facts. Or is this simply a compassionate vote? If he will put it on the true ground, and say it is purely a compassionate vote, and that it has merit, I am not going to oppose the vote, but I should like to have it put on a proper basis. Was there a legal liability in the first place—we will waive the Statute of Limitations; I do not think the government ought to plead the statute, although it has been done, and no doubt will have to be done again—or is it a compassionate allowance? Let us have the truth.

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted, there was a similar claim made upon the late government in respect to a contract carried on at Chimney Corner in the county of Inverness in 1919 and 1920. The contractor suffered loss, which he alleged was in the neighbourhood of $800. His claim was paid by the late government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, the only information we have as to this claim is that it was taken up and advocated by my hon. friend's political opponent. Evidently he did not have as much influence with the department as my hon. friend has.

Mr. KYTE: My opponent was not elected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I congratulate my hon. friend upon his influence with the department in getting this old claim resurrected. Mr. Chairman, I again call for the file in this case. I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) what in his view is justification for placing a claim as old as this in the list of supplementary items? Here is a claim that not only was known about when this parliament met, but it had existed since 1912. It is brought down here without a single bit of information; we cannot get the files, we cannot get the reports. What possible justification is there for bringing up a thing of this kind and putting it in the supplementary estimates? Under the circumstances I think my hon. friend ought at least to take the item out of these estimates and have it considered in the main estimates next year.

Mr. FIELDING: I admit I am sometimes suspicious of old claims, almost as suspicious as my hon. friend is when there is no ground for suspicion. But after all, the question is, is the money due? This matter came to my notice only recently; I did make inquiries of the department, and I was satisfied that investigation by the departmental engineers had shown that the money was due. The Minister of Public Works gave the matter much consideration and I had his assurance that his engineers and officers were decidedly of the opinion that the money was justly due, and upon that statement I consented to its going into the estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I press for the production of the files.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not debating that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any objection to producing the file? Is there any objection to the committee getting the facts in the matter?

Mr. FIELDING: I would not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I ask for the file.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In contracts for the construction of work of this character a clause is inserted which provides that where the work is prevented or interfered with by storm or other action of the elements, and so on, compensation may be had or performance of the contract would be regarded as having been made. I understand that in 1918, the then government had the question before them, in a case I have in mind, as to what should be done in such circumstances. I am instructed that investigation has shown that the parties acted in good faith and that they are entitled to settlement of the claim. I shall be glad, however, to have the file brought down, and to that end I ask that the item stand.

Item stands.

Little Harbour (Lower L'Ardoise)—breakwater extension and repairs, $2,000.

Mr. HANSON: Where is that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In Richmond county. The vote will cover the total cost of the necessary work—extension to wharf.

Item agreed to.

Little Harbour—breakwater repairs, $1,500.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is the county of Shelburne and Queens. The amount voted will complete the work. It is a matter of repairs.

Item agreed to.

Livingstone's Cove—wharf repairs, $1,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is in Antigonish and Guysborough. The vote will complete the repairs.

Item agreed to.

Lunenburg—dredging, $40,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think this item and the next—Malagash, dredging, $15,700—might be considered together; the same question is involved that we were dealing with before. Here is a lot of work in connection with which the government dredges might well be employed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is this an annual expenditure, or is it only for the present year?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Lunenburg is an important fishing town as well as a shipbuilding centre. The docks have to be cleaned out to provide adequate means of docking vessels and handling supplies at all stages of the tide. The channel has to be dredged along the face of the wharf so that approach may be possible at low tide. The estimated cost of the dredging is $103,000. The work will be done by tender and contract. The population of Lunenburg is 3,000. It is in the immediate vicinity of Chester, an important summer resort. I should think that this expenditure would be amply justified. As to the next vote, in regard to Malagash, this point is in the county of Cumberland, where three or four years ago a very valuable and extensive deposit of salt was found. Salt mines have been operated there and large quantities of it are shipped. This dredging has to be done to enable shipments to be carried on by vessels of such size as would transport material of this kind to the larger centres. I may say that information as to the disposition of the government owned dredges may be had by reference to Hansard of the earlier part of the session when the Main Estimates were under consideration. We have no adequate government dredging equipment to carry out the work that is necessary in these particular places. The same thing applies to the vote in connection with Pictou. No dredging of any kind has been done there for twelve years. A great deal of lumber is shipped from that port, and the dredging is necessary in order that the steamers can go in there and take freight. It is only with great difficulty that dredges can be found to do this work. One has been found and has been operating there for some little time. The information with regard to the government dredges my hon. friend will find in Hansard.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The trouble is that we cannot find it so that we can put it to any useful purpose now. I am confident we have not any information in Hansard which will enable us to draw any conclusions in the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am informed by the deputy that the whole programme is there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As to this particular matter?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Government dredging.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the price per yard for dredging here?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That would be determined by the tenders.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is the amount of this estimate arrived at?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The estimate of the engineer is 102,000 cubic yards scow measure of mud to be removed at 65 cents a yard; broken rock at $1 per cubic yard; solid rock at $7.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These items have been before the committee for the last couple of hours and there has been a good deal of discussion which certainly would give the committee the impression that we on this side are not in favour of these items, although we have not expressly challenged them by a division of the committee. This is an item, I think, upon which we may well have an expression of the opinion of the committee in regard to the whole of the expenditure contemplated in item No. 504 of the Supplementary Estimates, which amounts in all to $533,884. I am not selecting the item with respect to the dredging to be done at Lunenburg for any particular purpose except that it appears to be one of the larger items. The government contemplates an expenditure of $40,000 this year on work for which they have an estimate showing that a total of $103,000 or thereabouts will be required. There has nothing been offered to the House by the minister or by others to show there is any urgency in the matter, to show that the expenditure must be made at once. In fact the minister only proposes to do a little over one-third of it during the present year. The objection which we take on this side of the House is this: All these expenditures or the greater portion of them should have been in the Main Estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Perhaps my hon. friend does not know that we are simply carrying on the work that was started by the government with which he was connected. Money was voted for this work in 1914-1915, 1915-1916 and in 1916-1917, so my hon. friend might well spare his eloquence.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not going to spare my eloquence on that explanation. The contemplated expenditure is $103,000 for the whole work. This year the government proposes to expend $40,000. Now the objection which we in this part of the House take to the whole vote is that in the majority of instances these various items should have appeared in the main estimates, which were considered in this House in February, March and April of this year. But instead of that course the government has taken another. It has come down here in the last days of the session at a time when the opposition in this House has had practically no opportunity to inquire into or investigate the proposed expenditure. Now I submit that that is not good practice. I submit it is not fair to the House or to the country. We are entitled on this side of the House to just as full information in regard to each item as is the government. The government may have the knowledge but we have not and we are practically asked to vote these amounts blindly with very little information and practically no intelligent discussion or criticism. I for one at least, speaking for myself, object to that procedure. I have sat in this House and I have heard my hon. friend the Minister of Finance take a similar objection. In the last two sessions under the late government he complained that in the last hours of the session the government was bringing down heavy votes for the expenditure of large sums of money. I know that I shall be met by someone saying: Oh, your government did the same thing. The acting minister has already interrupted me to say, your government did the same thing. Of course, there is hardly a day passes in this House when that retort is not made from some quarter on the government benches, but it is the principle I am arguing for now, and I say the principle is a bad one. I say it is unsound to bring down in the dying hours of the session proposals for the expenditure of large amounts of money involving millions of dollars, which, if voted at all, is voted upon the scantiest information. There is nothing in the nature of urgency in regard to this particular item. For all we know the expenditure of five or ten thousand dollars this year would be just as well as an expenditure of $40,000. It is a matter of dredging, and I suppose some of it has to be done every year. Why the amount of $40,000 has been fixed upon I do not know, but in order to take the sense of the committee and to test the matter not only in regard to this item but in regard to all the items, because if we do not test it it will be said of us in the future that we did not vote against it—why did we allow it to pass? why didn't you move to reduce it?—if we merely sit here and utter our protests as we have done on item after item that gets us nowhere. Those protests, strong as they may be, are not put down as any opposition to the actual passage of the item, and for all that appears in the records of the House these items pass practically unopposed. Now to test this matter and to take only a single item, but to apply it to all the items comprised in vote No. 504 I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for South Simcoe:

That the item of $40,000 for "Lunenburg—Dredging" be reduced by the sum of $15,000.

That will leave $25,000 for the expenditure this year.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think we can find any fault with the hon. gentleman's making a motion. I am rather glad he couples with it the statement that he intends it to mean the condemnation of all these items for the province of Nova Scotia. Let it go on record.

Mr. FORKE: I would rather the hon. member who has moved this amendment had not made that declaration in regard to all the other items because I feel like supporting his motion, but I do not feel like subscribing to his declaration. I do not want to criticize unduly, but it does seem strange to me that there is no item for dredging at Lunenburg in the main estimates, while here we have an item of $40,000 for that purpose. For this reason I would support the amendment, but not subscribe to the statement in regard to all the other items because I cannot see the room for the same criticism in regard to them. I might say while I am on my feet that I think it would save time if the Acting Minister of Public Works would answer a few stock questions right away when each item is called.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I really do not know why my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has assumed this sudden attitude of virtue and horror at the government bringing down these supplementary estimates. It is rather a new role for him, though I have noticed a disposition along that line lately on his part. But my

hon. friend is not logical in this matter, and he knows it. There can be no suggestion of impropriety about this proposal for dredging at Lunenburg. My hon. friend has sat in this House long enough, and I sat with him long enough to know that this attitude of virtue on his part is largely assumed. It is really not sincere. My hon. friend will not venture to lay down the principle or attempt with any sincerity to argue that there can be any reasonable objection to this dredging proposal at Lunenburg. That port is a little Gloucester in Canada, and there is probably more business carried on there in connection with fishing than in any three or four other places in Canada. There are piers and business places along the waterfront and this dredging work which was initiated by my hon. friend's friends and carried out by them on a regular programme—a contract was let for the dredging, and in one year the work was done by government dredges—is absolutely necessary. Does my hon. friend mean to say that this dredging should not be done? What does he mean by this fantastic theory that this should have been in the Main Estimates? My hon. friend knows that that is not a practical proposal. He is not taking a sincere stand, and why he assumes this attitude I do not know. I think he ought to meet the issue squarely and say that there should be no dredging and repairs to public works in Nova Scotia. If he is speaking for his party let us know it.

Mr. BOYS: As the seconder of the motion I say that there is no such suggestion. There is not the slightest ground for the Acting Minister of Public Works throwing out such a thought. Many items have already been passed. We are entitled to information, and we are not getting it as fully as we should.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What do you want?

Mr. BOYS: I have asked for some information and it has been promised. The minister challenges me as if I had asked for something that I had got. The minister has promised me the information and I suppose I shall get it to-morrow. With respect to these items that are being submitted to the committee, we say that many of them should have appeared in the Main Estimates, and I have not heard anything from the minister which would indicate that this item in particular should not have been in the Main Estimates. He justifies it on the ground that it was commenced years and years ago. If that be the case there is every reason why the government should have known about this in January or February and submitted it earlier. No reason has been given why it was not submitted. All this amendment does is to say that this item should be reduced by $15,000. It does not in any way condemn all the works in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): When are the main estimates compiled? As I understand it they are compiled about November of the year before. I am a little interested in this matter because in the Ontario estimates there is an item for dredging in Collingwood harbour. That is not new work; it is unfinished work which has been laid over since 1917. However, it is absolutely needed in the interest of navigation in Collingwood harbour where grain is brought down by large boats from the head of the lakes to the elevators. I do not feel that I can support the amendment because the estimate for this work appears in the supplementary estimates. That is because we did not know that the main estimates were made up; we did not know anything about it at that time. Even so I shall be prepared to defend the item when the proper time comes.

Mr. GRAHAM: May I say a word. My hon. friend the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says this is to be a reduction. Well, it might apply to the whole list of items, including those in Ontario, Quebec and everywhere else. It will not do to single out one province and make all the reductions there. This fact should be remembered when we come to deal with the vote of $600,000 for the continuation of the work in Toronto harbour.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Cut it out.

Mr. GRAHAM: In that case might we not expect the same principle to be applied?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is not that appropriation being made in pursuance of an agreement. This government has agreed to expend that amount of money and we expect it to implement its promise.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not arguing against the expenditure I am just indicating how the argument of my hon. friends might be applied. It is just as well that we should know where we are heading. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Ross) made a very good point. Every member of the preceding government knows that the estimates are made up in the autumn, and information continues to come in with respect to them month after month in the manner which has been described. If we are going to say that supplementary estimates must be brought in at a certain date after the opening of parliament

let us establish that principle some day next session, so that members of parliament will be made aware of the fact and will have ample notice of it. But to begin to establish that principle now, to re-organize the whole system that has prevailed ever since I have been a member of parliament, is something that cannot be done. This practice has been in vogue ever since I can remember. I say frankly that my office has frequently been filled by members of parliament from both sides ever since the session opened. The majority of them do not come to Ottawa until their sessional duties demand their presence. Have we not right to listen to representations from any member of the House on the subject of estimates? The main estimates are made up and closed, as a rule, before any member comes here and information which is needed from members as to any particular item cannot be collected until the House meets. Practically every government that has ever been in power in Canada has recognized that fact. Have not hon. members the right to come and discuss these matters with the minister? I am free to say that I am glad to see members on either side of the House. I do not object to meeting them and I think none of them object to coming to see me about any of these matters relating to my department. When in opposition I have sat up in this House until very late in order to put through estimates at the end of the session. I do not think my hon. friend from South Wellington stayed to help me; he went home and did not remain the greater part of the night. With three or four Liberal colleagues I have remained until four or five o'clock in the morning when my Conservative friends were putting their estimates through, and prorogation took place the next evening.

Mr. BELAND: No, on the same day.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. Circumstances sometimes arise when you have to do these things. The hon. member for South Wellington at first said he was laying down a principle, but he took that back. He said he did not take any exception to the principle of voting the estimates but only to the amount. It is not a principle then which is involved but only an amount. The question here is should we spend $25,000 or $40,000. That is not a statement of a principle. If the House wished to establish a principle the proper thing to do would be to have a discussion early next session, as to whether the Supplementary Estimates should be brought in late except under the most extraordinary circumstances. Let the question be discussed then and settled so that the members will all know there will not be any Supplementary Estimates brought down after a certain date. We cannot get away by a vote of this kind from the principle and practice that has been followed by every government ever since there has been a parliament in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that my hon. friend is quite fair in his statement of the position in this case. There is no objection whatever to Supplementary Estimates. We have to have Supplementary Estimates, there is no question about that. He is also not quite fair when he says that the estimates are finished the autumn before. Why, the Estimates this year were not finished until after the return of the Minister of Finance from overseas.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend knows that every department had its Main Estimates well advanced, if not actually completed, before the new government came into power.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me my hon. friend did not ask a question, he made a statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: I apologize.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everyone who has been in a government knows that the estimates have to be got out in time and that parliament generally meets before they are printed. This very year parliament was in session and the Speech from the Throne was being discussed before the estimates were printed. You also have to have Supplementary Estimates, there is no question about that either. Nor is there any doubt that the ministers have to meet members of parliament. The only thing we want to do is to find out what the view of the House is on this question. That is, admitting the necessity, as we do, of these Supplementary Estimates, and admitting the necessity of a lot of the things we have heard, the question is whether the Supplementary Estimates are to be brought in at a time which will allow discussion and investigation or not. That is all we are trying to establish.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I said before this House will remain in session for another week and discuss these estimates if any single member desires it and we will not sit later than midnight. There will be ample time afforded for discussing these items if it is desired.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know about that at all. My right hon. friend knows very well that arrangements have been made for members to leave.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No arrangements have been made.

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

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I cannot resist my hon. friend's smiling countenance.

Mr. BELAND: What has been the custom in the past in dealing with Supplementary Estimates? How many days before prorogation have they been discussed?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Ah, I am ready to remember some of the admonitions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and one in particular about "Those Bourbons that never forget and never learn."

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend forgets but he does not learn.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are learning.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am going to teach you something else.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not saying it was not done in the past. Of course it was. I do not know whether we did it in the past when there was such a rush of legislation as we have had in the last two or three days. But is it the idea of the House that this is the proper thing to do? Do not run away with the thought that the Minister of Railways, has propounded, that we are against supplementary estimates. We know that we have to have them, but we are of the view that they should be brought down in time, not only for discussion but for full investigation. So far as this vote is concerned, it is merely to register what the feeling of the House is upon the question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will take the opportunity of presenting Revised Hansard of March 9, 1923, page 1009, where the minister gave in detail the work of the government dredges for the coming year, and dealt with the whole matter. With that information before the House, which my hon. friend for North Wellington could very well have got, if he had had any curiosity on the subject, by sending for Hansard, I should like to know what he means by the motion. Are we going to have a motion to reduce an estimate by $15,000 because, forsooth, the estimates should have been brought down sooner? What possible logic is there in a request to reduce the vote by $15,000, because he thinks the estimates should have been brought down sooner? The reason why the item was not brought down in the main estimates was because the programme of the government dredges for the year had to be made up, and it was not known during the winter months whether or not Lunenburg could be included in that programme?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister can hardly say that, when he gives me the whole programme back in March.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Of course, I can. This motion is perfectly absurd.

Mr. GARDINER: I have listened with a great deal of interest to this little squabble which has been going on all evening. I am not particularly interested in the controversy between the two parties in the House, but I am particularly interested in the question as to whether this $40,000 is actually required or not. The minister has not given the House the information as to this particular vote, that he should give if he expects the vote to go through. If he does not, I will consider that the vote is not necessary.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If the hon. member will tell me what information he wants, I will give it. I have mentioned the quantities of material and have told hon. members the kind of place Lunenburg is, the necessity for the work and the estimated cost. If he wants to know anything more I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. GARDINER: Any information the acting minister has given has been more or less in a conversational tone, with his friends on the opposite side. We have heard nothing at all of the discussion which has been proceeding all evening, and if the minister does not wish to give us the information we ask for, I am going to vote against the amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment (Mr. Guthrie) which was negatived. Yeas, 27; Nays, 91.

Item agreed to.

Malagash—dredging, $15,700.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister seriously suggest that any portion of the product of the salt or potash works at Malagash will be taken out by steamer?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend has a fashion of uttering innuendos. I know that some of the most important men in my county are interested in this matter and some friends of the hon. member. I have a letter on the subject from Messrs. Chambers and MacKay, miners and manufacturers of Malagash salt, asking for the completion of dredging, to permit steamer shipments from the Malagash salt mines, and stating further:

When the dredging is completed within the areas shown to the proposed depth of 15 feet at low water, and a cut provided so that a 250 foot steamer can move back and forth to load all hatches under a conveyor that we will require to build from the shore to the wharf head, which provision your engineers have in mind, we will be able then not only to load the craft supplying the fishing trade, but also to load lake steamers and thus be able to go after the general demand and the chemical and pulp requirements for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

And so they go on. The nature of the deposit there is unquestioned.

Mr. HANSON: No doubt about that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend lives so close to Nova Scotia that he ought to know what is going on. The estimated cost is the amount of the vote. My memorandum of the proposed works reads:

To increase the area of the basin to a length of 250 feet, and width of 400 feet, and provide a depth of 15 feet at low water.

It is recommended by the engineer and there is no question about it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that the complete estimate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Dredging.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it getting down to a new basis, or is it just maintaining the present channel?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): New requirements.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it new work?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I read the letter from Messrs. Chambers and MacKay about the steamers.

Item agreed to.

Margaree harbour—repairs to harbour works, $9,700.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is the estimated cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Date of report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Requested by engineer Dodwell in estimates of 1923-24.

Item agreed to.

Margaretville—repairs to breakwater, $2,400.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in the county of Annapolis, and this will complete the work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of the report in that case?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The report is from the district engineer in his estimates for 1923-24.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of the report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is the general report making up the requirements for the year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No apparent reason why that was not in the Main Estimates.

Item agreed to.

Meteghan—wharf extension, $7,600.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is in the counties of Yarmouth and Clare.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister give the explanation in a little louder voice?

The CHAIRMAN: I would like members of the committee to desist from conversation. There are several members of the committee, in different groups, discussing various matters, making it absolutely impossible sometimes for the Chair to hear the questions put or the minister's response. I would urge that conversation be not continued. It makes it very difficult for us to hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This proposal is for the extension of a wharf in the village of Meteghan in the county of Clare. It is to construct a cribwork extension 60 feet long, 28 feet high, to the existing wharf. The estimated cost is the amount contained in the vote and should complete the work.

Mr. ARTHURS: What is the population?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My information is that there is a population of 1,000. I know the district surrounding it is a very progressive part of the county of Clare and Yarmouth.

Item agreed to.

New Harris—wharf, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this a repair again?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is to construct a block and span wharf with creosoted timber substructure extending to 12 feet at low water. The estimated cost is $5,000. It is to enable the steamer "Marion" which passes here daily during the season to call with freight and passengers. The nearest wharf is 6 miles distant, and the roads around are on the side of a steep mountain and are at times impassable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not a repair?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Mr. BOYS: Is it inland?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, on the shore.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this the final amount?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is there to show the necessity of a new wharf there?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The steamer "Marion" which is the steamer which travels in that vicinity, comes in there. The engineer's report is as follows:

The steamer plying between Sydney and Whycocomagh goes by this settlement during open navigation three days a week, going up to Whycocomagh and three days a week coming down. There are also various other boats, some of them subsidized, passing through the Bras d'Or lakes, and they could call at some suitable point at this district if there was a wharf, but there being none, the people in this section of country have either to travel to New Campbellton or to Big Harbour in order to take advantage of the boats going through the lakes.

Item agreed to.

Nyanza wharf repairs, $1,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is in North Cape Breton.

Item agreed to.

North Ingonish (McLeod's)—reconstruction of breakwater and dredging, $34,700.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister give us some general information in regard to this item which is a pretty large one?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is to reconstruct the destroyed portion of the breakwater on a length of 277 feet, width 22 to 24 feet and height 12 feet. Creosoted timber to be used to 3 feet above low water level, and native timber above this level. It is also to construct a concrete retaining wall 90 feet long, 2 feet wide at top and 5 feet wide at the bottom. There is dredging to be done at the outer end of the breakwater involving the removal of 10,500 cubic yards of sand and gravel and the removal of 5,000 cubic yards of sand and ballast from the inside of the breakwater where it has been carried from the destroyed section of the dock. The estimated cost is $34,625, or about the amount of the vote.

This work was seriously damaged some years ago, and at present the superstructure of the outer 277 feet is completely destroyed. The inner portion of the breakwater which has not been wrecked, is to be protected by a concrete wall, to prevent it from being carried away. For the safety of the structure, it is necessary that the whole of this work be done. There are 105 boats that fish from this harbour, and the value of fish landed annually is approximately $52,000. There was an appropriation voted on this wharf in 1920. Tenders were called for the work, but a contract was not awarded.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the fishing trade of $52,000 all the trade that is done at this point, or are there other trades?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): North Ingonish is one of the famous spots in Cape Breton county. In addition to its being a fishing centre, for the fishing between Cape Smoky and Cape North, it is also the centre of a very large lumber business. I think from North Ingonish shipments of pulp are being made, and a very large business is being carried from there into the centre of the county by the Oxford Paper Company.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is there any railroad to that point?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

North Sydney—breakwater repairs, $3,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is this county?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in North Cape Breton. It is right near the town.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does the report say on this?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is the breakwater which protects the harbour of North Sydney which was damaged by the storm of last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is this $3,000 worth of work proposed to be done?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): By tender and contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the present rules of tender and contract? I forget them. How long has the advertising to continue?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am told there is no change since my hon. friend's time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said that I had forgotten. I am asking for information.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Surely not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely yes. What are the rules as to advertising for tenders?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): About three weeks in the newspapers in the province where the work is to be carried on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In this particular case, is there any restriction as to plant or anything else?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The amount is not very great. It is only to get the 16,000 cubic feet of native timber, and place it in position. That is practically all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a pretty simple matter.

Mr. GOULD: As regards the various items, what supervision does the department take over the completed work to see that the work is built to specification?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): An engineer inspects every work to see that the specifications are lived up to.

Item agreed to.

Parrsboro—repairs to breakwater and shed on wharf, $1,350.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is in the county of Cumberland.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the date of the report there?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): May 28, 1923.

Item agreed to.

Pictou Light Beach—repairs and reconstruction of protection work, $1,200.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is to protect a sand beach at the end of which a lighthouse stands. There have been encroachments by the sea, and if this is not protected, the whole lighthouse might be cut out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose this is in the county of Pictou?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. GOULD: This item reads: "Reconstruction of protection work." One might infer from that that some neglect of work had happened in the past.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No. In many cases in the Maritime provinces at entrances to our harbours, sand bars run out. The whirling of the sand by the surrounding waters of the ocean for years, causes sand to accumulate. At the mouth of Halifax harbour, which is one of the greatest harbours in the country, a sand bar runs out, and at the end of the sand bar a lighthouse is erected. The same is true at Pictou and Sydney harbours. In order to preserve the sand bar so that it will not be destroyed by storms cutting it completely, works have been erected continually for years. As the wood is destroyed by the teredo nivalis it has to be renewed, otherwise the lighthouse would be lost and there would be no protection to the mariners. The life of these protected works is somewhere between eight and nine years. If the wood is not creosoted the works will not last long.

Item agreed to.

Piper's cove—wharf repairs, $1,100.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): North Cape Breton county.

Item agreed to.

Point Aconi—breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. GOULD: What will this be constructed of?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Creosoted timber will have to be used in order to prevent destruction by the worm or teredo as it is called. This breakwater will cost $25,000 according to the estimate. It is recommended by Mr. Dodwell, the district engineer. It is situated between the entrance to great and little Bras d'or channel. The work is necessary for the protection of the coast as well as for the fishing and farming population. The breakwater is 492 feet long.

Mr. GOULD: What is the total cubic feet of the completed work?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): 108,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose we cannot work that in as a repair, anyway?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Item agreed to.

Port Beckerton—wharf repairs, $2,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Antigonish and Guysborough county. It is the estimated cost.

Item agreed to.

Port Greville—further amount required for breakwater repairs and harbour improvements, $18,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in the county of Cumberland, and the estimated cost of the work is the amount of the vote. It consists of repairs to the breakwater and wharf to overcome damage occasioned by storms.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much is repair and how much harbour improvement?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Repairs to breakwater, $12,000, wharf $3,000, beach protection, $3,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is all repairs. This is wrongly worded.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. GOULD: What is the estimated price per thousand feet on the timber?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Estimated by the cubic foot, creosoted timber 35 cents, native timber 15 cents.

Item agreed to.

Portuguese cove—breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Halifax county. The repairs comprise construction of cribwork breakwater. This is one of the most exposed locations on the Atlantic coast where supplies for the wireless station at Camperdown are landed. It is one of the best known fishing villages on the coast.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I daresay, but most of the heavy items are not repairs at all, they are new works.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I was not quite accurate. District Engineer Dodwell reports that the old work was so badly damaged by the storm in 1919 that it is not considered advisable to attempt to repair it, as the money expended would exceed the cost of a new breakwater.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is in substitution?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Pictou—dredging, $15,200.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in Pictou county and is to provide for coal and lumber shipping.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the dredging to be done in the harbour at Pictou?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Pembroke—wharf extension, $3,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Hants county. This is an extension of the existing wharf. The estimated cost is the amount of the vote.

Item agreed to.

Port Lorne—breakwater extension, $9,600.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is the estimated cost. Digby and Annapolis county.

Item agreed to.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Riverport—revetment wall for dredged soil, $20,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is to provide towards construction of retaining wall barriers to retard the flowing of the material back into the channel which is being dredged near the mouth of the Lahave river. The estimate for 1922-23 is $12,000 to provide for construction of a retaining barrier between Parks island and the mainland. The material dredged last season was dumped behind this barrier, which worked successfully. The district engineer proposes to raise the height of the barrier at a cost of $14,000 To construct the barrier between the north end of Parks island and the mainland will cost $6,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is the dredging being done by the government dredge?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. GOULD: The Atlantic ocean being on the eastern side and the bay of Fundy on the western side of Nova Scotia, on which side does the minister find it most expensive to keep the various wharves and breakwaters in repair?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It depends whether native wood be found in the vicinity of the work to be constructed. Where the material has to be carried a long distance, of course the cost is increased.

Mr. GOULD: Native wood is used?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): As well as creosoted.

Item agreed to.

Round Hill—wharf repairs, $1,700.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Digby and Annapolis county. Estimated cost.

Item agreed to.

Sanford—retaining wall, $1,800.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is that used for navigation too?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes. It is in Yarmouth county. Full estimated cost.

Item agreed to.

Scott's bay—rebuilding part of north breakwater, $8,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): King's county. Full estimated cost.

Item agreed to.

Scotch Cove (White Point)—breakwater repairs, $2,600.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Estimated cost. North Cape Breton county.

Item agreed to.

Shad bay—wharf repairs, $1,500.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Halifax county. Estimated cost.

Item agreed to.

Sheet Harbour West—rebuilding wharf, $5,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Halifax county. Full estimated cost.

Item agreed to.

Shelburne—wharf repairs, $4,500.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): County, Shelburne and Queen's. Estimated cost to renew stringers, guard rails and planking in the wharf.

Item agreed to.

Smith's cove—breakwater extension and beach protection, $2,400.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: What is this beach protection?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is at Smith's cove in the county of Inverness. The amount to be expended is the estimated cost.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is that to protect the village? ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes

Item agreed to.

Sonora—purchase of wharf and rebuilding same, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What county is this in?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Antigonish.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is the wharf repurchased from, and why?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This amount is to purchase the McCutcheon wharf at Sonora. The district engineer reports that the owners of the wharf asked $5,000 for it, but as the wharf is in a dilapidated condition they considered the price too high and recommended that the owners be offered $3,500, which is their own price less the cost of rehabilitation. The owners are reported to have spent $5,000 to $7,000 in repairs during the last three years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the idea of purchasing this wharf? Apparently you are purchasing a liability.

Mr. McISAAC: This is an important fishing district, and the fishermen there have petitioned for a wharf. This wharf at Sonora was owned by McCutcheon Brothers who were in business some years ago, but they went out of business lately and are not going to continue to keep the wharf in repair. When the engineers were sent down to report on the matter they examined several localities in search of a suitable place for a wharf, and they found that it would be cheaper and in the public interest to buy this wharf rather than build a new one. The owners asked $5,000 for it, but the engineers offered only $3,500, and with an additional $1,500 the wharf can be made as good as new. It is necessary to have a wharf in that locality, because the needs of a large and important fishing community will thereby be served.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where do the boats go now?

Mr. McISAAC: From there, but they have to pull their boats up on the shore and perhaps get them smashed to pieces, as frequently happens in other places.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the dimensions of this wharf?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) The wharf is 150 feet long and 36 feet wide. The outer end is on the river channel and is 20.5 feet high along the outer face, the shoreward 120 feet of its length averaging 6.5 feet in height.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this wharf in a private water lot, or in open water, Crown property?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It would be private property under our law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then what about the approach? Is that included in the purchase?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) What has been obtained is not only the wharf but the approach to the main highway.

Item agreed to.

South lake—breakwater extension, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Antigonish. It is for extension and repairs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much for extension and how much for repairs?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The estimated cost of 48,600 cubic feet of cribwork at 20 cents is $9,400. The district engineer reports that the channel has shoaled so that it is of little service. A wing addition to the south breakwater is proposed to narrow

the channel so as to create scour and make it navigable for small boats.

Item agreed to.

Ship harbour—wharf repairs, $4,200.

Mr. GOULD: I suggest that as Nova Scotia owns her own natural resources she might at least be called upon to build the approaches to these various wharves.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I did not say we were going to build the approaches to the wharves. The reference in the last item was to the narrowing of the channel so as to make it navigable for small boats. Ship Harbour is in Halifax county. The estimated cost is the amount of the vote. It is to construct a pilework wharf 80 feet long and 20 feet wide with an ell 20 feet by 30 feet. The purpose is to provide shipping accommodations for the residents of Ship Harbour and the surrounding districts by shortening the haul from the mills to the now only available wharf by a distance of about 4½ miles, over a very hilly road. It is a farming and fishing district.

Item agreed to.

Summerville—wharf repairs, $5,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is in Hants county. It is for repairs to wharf, consisting of the building of the outer fifty feet destroyed by ice in April, 1923.

Item agreed to.

Windsor—wharf, $22,000.

Mr. GOULD: The good things of life do not appear to be very evenly distributed. There seems to be too much salt water down in the Maritime provinces, and too many bluenoses.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Too few, the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. GOULD: The capital expenditures are not, in my estimation, exactly what they should be.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of repair work is this?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The conditions along the shore of Hants county are very difficult to appreciate. The tide in the Bay of Fundy rises and falls about sixty feet, a condition which does not prevail in any other part of the country. The result is that the maintenance of wharves and approaches is very difficult indeed, because when the tide is out there may be nothing there but the bottom of the bay. The wharves can only be approached at high tide. This extension work is to consist of a public wharf along the water front in a westerly direction from the railroad wharf. The only wharf owned by the Public Works department is a small pier made of cribwork having a 70 foot frontage, which is inadequate for the shipping to and from this port. There are very large shipments of gypsum and lumber made from Windsor. There is a tremendous industry carried on there by the King Company who carry gypsum from Windsor to Bayonne, New Jersey. Hants county is also one of our greatest lumbering counties. There have been grave complaints about the lack of wharf accommodation at this place for a long time. There were four million feet of lumber shipped from there last fall and the possibilities of greater shipments and greater trade are very bright. Favourable reports are made on the proposal by the engineer for the department and by everyone who has investigated the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it the local member has not very much objection.

Mr. MARTELL: Hants county is all right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And its member.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Prince Edward Island—Beach Point—wharf, $7,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of repairs are to be done at Beach wharf?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is to construct a cribwork wharf 238 feet long and from 20 to 30 feet wide. The estimated cost is $7,500. The only wharf accommodation in this vicinity is a small privately owned structure known as Prowse and Sons' wharf, located at the extreme outer end of Old Store Point immediately at the harbour's entrance, the road approach to which is over a long sand beach very unsuitable for heavy traffic, and further, drifting sand frequently shoals up the water in front of this wharf to such an extent that at times it becomes entirely useless for shipping purposes.

The residents of Beach Point and vicinity, numbering several hundred, who have surplus farm produce to ship each season estimated in value at $50,000, and also desire to import their coal, and so forth, by water, therefore, request that suitable accommodation be provided for this business as well as the fishing industry, by constructing a small wharf or landing from the shore, near Irving's Lane, to keep water in the basin recently dredged.

There are 50 to 60 fishermen at this place whose season's catch of lobster, cod and other fish is estimated at from $30,000 to $40,000 annually.

Georgetown—to take over and repair C.N.R. wharf, $20,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the justification for taking over the Canadian National wharf at Georgetown? Is this another scheme to relieve the railway of its ordinary obligations?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I can give some explanation of this matter having been in Georgetown a year or so ago. Formerly Georgetown was the port in Price Edward Island through which communication was maintained in winter between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. A very large expenditure involving a very great annual loss was begun in 1912 by the construction of the works at Cape Borden and Cape Tormentine and the standard gauging of the railway in Prince Edward Island, and the maintaining of the very expensive boats for carrying the trains over. This wharf at Georgetown was the only wharf available for the people of the town for carrying on their business. It had been built by the railway and was used by the steamers in connection with the town's export business. When the change came in regard to the connections with the mainland and the boats ran no more to Georgetown in winter, the railway simply let the wharf go into absolute decay. It spent no money on it and in consequence the business people of the town had no means by which they could ship by water. The railway had no further interest in it on account of the change in the management. That I think is the situation and the warrant for this vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When was the wharf originally put up?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It was constructed in 1905, creosoted piling being used, and it is assumed that such portion is still in serviceable condition. Here is a letter from Sir Henry Thornton with reference to the wharf:

I am in hopes that the Public Works department will see their way clear to take this wharf and shed over, because so far as the railway is concerned, there is practically no business handled over the wharf and there is no justification for the company being called upon to stand the expense necessary to repair the dock. We would be willing to turn the wharf and shed over to the Public Works department on a reasonable valuation, and it really seems to me a public work that should be looked after by that department of the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is being paid to the system for it? It seems to me the Public Works department is taking over a liability. I think they should be paid by the railway for taking it over instead of paying the railway.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is expected by the department that they will be able to get control of the wharf without paying anything to the railway. Sir Henry Thornton states that it is of no further use to the railway.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is taking over a responsibility, it seems to me. What about this $20,000? How is that divided?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The estimated cost is as follows: Renewal of approach, $10,000; renewal of dock on west side, $9,000; renewal of dock on east side, say $1,000; making a total of $20,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would put it in good shape, would it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—New Brunswick—Negro Point—breakwater extension, $8,000.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not complaining at all but I just wanted to ask the minister a question in regard to the Negro Point breakwater extension. We are very glad to have this amount voted, but I think the estimate was considerably over a million dollars for the whole work and with this $100,000 very little can be done. There would be some danger in the winter season of possible dislocation of what might be done with only $100,000. Since we are having supplementaries, would it not be possible to raise this to at least one-fourth of the amount that will be required and make a more substantial commencement this season?

Mr. ROBB: How much would the hon. member suggest?

Mr. BAXTER: I suggest putting $250,000 in the estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): As my hon. friend knows these are the last estimates that are coming down this session, and I would not like to take the responsibility in the absence of the regular minister of increasing this amount, although I am sure he sympathizes with my hon. friend's ambitions.

Mr. BAXTER; Just change the figure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we might as well take all the votes in bulk unless hon. gentlemen have objections. We have tried to get information item by item on the first province that was called and we know no more about the necessities of any single vote than if we had not asked a question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Do not say that after my talking all night.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Quebec—Rimouski—in full and final settlement of claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot in connection with their contract for harbour improvements, $51,892.85.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We should have a little information about this item.

Mr. BAXTER: While the minister is getting the information asked for I should like to ask him if the statement in the St. John papers that the department intends to close the gap at Negro Point by a solid structure is correct? I also notice in the press that there is a possibility of using some system of compressed air that would be available during storms?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am informed the matter is now being investigated and the probabilities point to the course my hon. friend has spoken of being adopted.

Now as to the Raymond-Talbot contract: This contract was entered into on March 21, 1914, with Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, and it was to have been completed in 1916. One of the stipulations of the contract was that it was to have been completed within two years of its being signed. On April 18th, 1914, the contractors were ordered to go on with the work. During the summer of 1914 the war broke out. Early in 1915 the contractors were advised not to go on with the work until further orders. In 1915 the government did not ask parliament for a vote for this work. In 1916 the contractors were to go on with it. They did so during the seasons of 1916-17 but claimed that on account of the great increase in the cost of labour and materials due to the war, and for other reasons, they had incurred certain losses. By authority of an order in council passed on the 4th November, 1918, a copy of which I will send to my hon. friend, it was provided that the department should take over the contractor's plant at actual cost less depreciation, and that the chief engineer should make a careful investigation and report as to the fairest and most equitable final settlement with the contractors after careful consideration of their claim for compensation in connection with alleged losses and reasons for the same.

[Mr. Baxter.]

The chief engineer went fully into the matter and came to the conclusion to recommend a payment of $48,384 with interest. He did this in pursuance of the terms of an order in council passed in 1918.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has given us information from the engineer's report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice in vote No. 507 which we are now considering this item:

Ste Petronille (Island of Orleans)—to purchase and repair wharf, $37,100.

I should like to know whether this wharf has been purchased and from whom?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This amount of $37,100 is required to purchase or expropriate from La Cie Maritime & Industrielle de Lévis its timber wharf as Ste. Pétronille. The wharf is at the south-western end of the island in the most suitable place, away from bad currents and sheltered against prevailing winds. The district engineer's valuation of the wharf is $21,819; his valuation of the land $3,000; and the estimated cost of repairs required $12,250.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would the minister tell us how many wharves there are already on the island?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Perhaps I would be permitted to answer the question. There are six wharves on the island but this one affords the most convenient outlet. The wharf is in very bad condition. It is owned by La Compagnie Maritime Industrielle de Lévis. The whole population of the island, which consists of six very important parishes, has united in asking the government to purchase this wharf and put it in good condition so that it might be available for the use of any one.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Ontario, $564,171.

Mr. MEWBURN: Now that we are taking up the items for Ontario I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a remark he made earlier in the evening. I think I am correct in attributing to him the statement that where any government wharves were carrying on a proper commercial business it would be a very fair subject for criticism if attention was not given to them. I regret the Minister of Railways is not in his seat; I should like him to have heard the statement I am about to make. For the last two years representations have been made to the government regarding the piers at

Port Maitland on Lake Erie. I may say this is not in my constituency so I am not personally interested in it. The parties who were making the representations for the repairing of this wharf were referred from the Public Works department to the Department of Railways, both departments refusing to take charge of the "baby." However, this year the latter department admitted they were responsible for it and it was represented that some provision would be made in the Supplementary Estimates. I may say this pier or wharf at Port Maitland is badly in need of repair. Some 250 or 300 feet of the east pier have been washed away, seriously menacing the safety of the channel and the west pier. A great deal of expense has been incurred by the government in dredging this channel and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company have been running for some time a car ferry across lake Erie. Last year they carried 5,462 loaded cars representing 244,296 tons, which tonnage would have been very much higher had it not been for the coal strike. The commodities carried on that ferry north bound consisted of coal, coke, steel, sand and brick, stone, chemicals, oil, meat and miscellaneous. South bound the commodities consisted of machinery and implements, foods, carbide and ore, scrap iron, paper, pulp, lumber, asbestos and chemicals. The wharf is in such a dangerous condition that it is a menace to the other pier there and it will only be a very short time before the government will have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars whereas a moderate expenditure at this time would effect a large saving. I should like to have some explanation from the government as to why an important work of this nature should have been ignored, whereas sums amounting to $100,000 are being spent elsewhere.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The wharf or pier to which my hon. friend refers is under the control of the Railway department. I am sorry the minister is not in the chamber at present, but I will be very glad to direct his attention to the matter.

Jackson's Point—to purchase and reconstruct wharf, $8,000.

Mr. HARRIS: Will the minister be good enough to tell us what amount of this item is required for the purchase and what portion for reconstruction—not necessaarily whose riding it is in.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The object of this vote is to purchase or expropriate from Mr. J. M. McDonald a timber cribwork wharf 159 feet long by 36 feet wide, including a warehouse and right of way thereto, and to reconstruct the wharf superstructure. The district engineer's estimate of the value of the wharf and right of way is $6,000, and to reconstruct the superstructure will cost $2,000, making a total amount of $8,000. The request for this work to be done came from Mr. A. B. Anderson, secretary, Sutton and Jackson's Point Board of Trade, Sutton West, Ont., in which he forwards a petition with reference to the harbour and wharf at Jackson's Point, together with letters from Mr. T. L. Church, M.P., Mr. T. Herbert Lennox, K.C., M.P.P., and a letter and blueprints from Mr. J. M. McDonald the present owner of the property.

Mr. HARRIS: How much was paid for it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Nothing has been paid.

Mr. HARRIS: How much is going to be paid?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is estimated the value of the wharf is $6,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think in looking over the Ontario vote we will not be able to get rid of it very quickly. I suggest that we let it stand and go on with the next.

Item stands.

Harbours and rivers—Manitoba, $71,650.

Mr. CALDWELL: Evidently there are not many docks in Manitoba, but there seem to be some sewers. What is meant by this?

Item agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL: I asked the question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It was explained several times. Surely the hon. member heard the explanation.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Saskatchewan and Alberta, $13,000.

Mr. GOULD: Pretty small vote.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—Roads and Bridges:

Grand Etang—Construction of bridge	$13,200 00
International bridge over river St. John between Edmundston, N.B., and Fort Kent, Me., the state of Maine to provide $15,000, county of Aroostook $10,000, and town of Fort Kent $5,000—revote of lapsed amount	29,000 00
Interprovincial bridge over the Ottawa river at Hawkesbury, the Ontario and Quebec governments to each contribute one-third of the cost	40,000 00

Interprovincial bridge over Ottawa river between Ottawa and Hull—paving of approach 5,000 00

Mr. FIELDING: There is an error in this item. Strike out the word "Edmundston" and insert "Clair."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the interprovincial bridge over the Ottawa river at Hawkesbury? When was the agreement arrived at? Is that a new matter or one of the old things?

Mr. MACDONALD: Arrangement was made, as indicated in the vote, between the Ontario and Quebec governments for the construction of an interprovincial bridge across the river between Hawkesbury and Grenville, the Ontario and Quebec governments each to contribute one-third of the cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of the agreement?

Mr. MACDONALD: There is no actual agreement in writing between the parties. This vote is proposed to be taken, so that if an agreement is arrived at between the parties it will be available for the construction of the bridge.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What authority is going to build the bridge?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The federal government.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Nova Scotia, $9,600.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: These telegraph items are practically all the same?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The House could get no explanation at the present time that would be any good, but some of the items look rather serious. There is one of $20,000. Some time ago the question of doing away with all these poles that are a constant source of expense was under consideration. I know that the late government determined to get rid of the constant expense and to put in wireless. Has that matter been proceeded with? We are going on spending a lot more money, and we are going to lose it. It is only a question of time till the change is made.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think that applies principally to the northern line in British Columbia running through to the Yukon. That line has been practically abandoned. Annually, it appears to have cost a good deal of money. These small lines are not in that particular locality but in the general estimates there are considerable amounts for these particular lines. There was also a sum voted for the construction of wireless equipment at Dawson City. We are now asking for a further amount of $19,000 to connect with Dawson.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are spending money on these lines now. Here is $45,000 for a service which ought to be performed by wireless. What is the good of going on with wireless while maintaining all these other lines?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That will not be done. This money will not all be spent—that is not for the whole line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is for the whole line in the supplementaries.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had a number of these lines at one time, and got rid of them. We made a lot of money by disposing of them for nothing. The provinces turned them into telephone lines. This was done in Alberta and Saskatchewan. It is a source of expense to the government and they are getting nothing out of it. We are spending money looking after the old lines. I hope before another year we will have a definite plan.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Some of the work comes under the Department of Public Works, but I understand there will be no overlapping. In British Columbia there appears to be a considerable number of these lines still remaining.

Item agreed to.

Dredging—Maritime provinces, further amount required. $25,000.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, further amount required, $50,000.

Dredging—British Columbia, further amount required, $16,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Would the minister give us some information in regard to this dredging item? The Main Estimates contain item No. 164 for dredging in the Maritime provinces, $600,000. When that estimate was under discussion, I asked the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) what dredging it was proposed to do, and the answer he gave me appears in Hansard of March 9 last. Out of that amount of $600,000, he proposed to dredge Lunenburg harbour. To-night a couple of hours ago, for Lunenburg again, we voted another $40,000, and in this item we have a further amount required for

dredging of $25,000. I do not understand on what principle this money is asked for, and I would be very much obliged if the minister would enlighten the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I shall be glad to give my hon. friend the places in the Maritime provinces which have to be dredged in addition to the list given before. My hon. friend will find that these total $45,000 approximately:

Nova Scotia		
Canso (Antigonish-Guysboro Co.)	9,600	
Cape St. Mary (Yarmouth-Clare Co.)	3,400	
Deep Brook (Digby Annapolis Co.)	1,000	
Eastern Points (Lunenburg Co.)	771	
Jordan Bay (Shelburne & Queen's Co.)	1,340	
McLeod's Harbour (Lunenburg Co.)	1,021	
Port Medway (Shelburne & Queen's Co.)	1,000	
Wolfville (King's Co.)	2,000	
		$20,132
New Brunswick		
Cocagne Harbour (Kent Co.)	1,150	
Kouchibouguac Narrows (Kent Co.)	10,000	
Neguac (Northumberland Co.)	2,800	
Wilson's Beach (Charlotte Co.)	2,300	
		16,250
Prince Edward Island		
Savage Harbour (King's Co.)	8,500	
		8,500
Grand Total		$44,882

Mr. GUTHRIE: That hardly gives the information I desire. My point is that we voted $600,000 in the Main Estimates, and the minister gave us a list, as appears in Hansard of March 9, of the dredging work he proposed to carry on. In that list, Lunenburg is mentioned for 200,000 cubic yards. To-night we have been asked to vote, and have voted, $40,000 for Lunenburg. Now comes a third vote of $25,000 for dredging in the Maritime provinces. What is the necessity of three votes? Why were they not all put into one, or at most, into two? It is certain, when the minister made his statement on March 9, he intended the $600,000 which we then voted, to cover Lunenburg, and I assume he also intended that amount to cover the other dredging in that part of the country. I cannot understand what this extra $25,000 is intended for.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister will like to say something upon this point. I do not think he would like it to be thought for one minute—and I am sure he did not do so intentionally—that he deceived the committee. I asked for a delay at one time for the purpose of looking into this very question, to see whether the dredging under the main vote was to be allocated for the particular work we had in the item then under discussion. He sent the information to me after the vote was finished. He assured us that it had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the places we were discussing. I am quite sure my hon. friend did not have the information before him, and he would like to straighten out the matter to the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The matter is quite simple. If my hon. friend would stop and think for a moment, he would at once see it. What the Minister of Public Works did on March 9 was to give to the committee the programme of the number of cubic yards that he expected to be handled at that time. When they came to work the matter out in an endeavour to work in the government dredge, in order to get this work actually done, they found, so I am instructed, that it was impossible to do this with the item of $600,000 that was voted. Therefore they come to parliament in order to get the extra amount of $25,000. This extra work, the items of which I gave to-night, will have to be done by private dredges, outside of the government dredges, all of which are employed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely my hon. friend knows what we wanted this information for. It was to see whether the government could put the dredges in the places where the work was to be done. I certainly understood the minister to say that this had nothing at all to do with those places. He says, however, that the matter is perfectly simple. We have three different jobs going on all at once!

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not understand my hon. friend. I think the explanation is very clear. I did not see the statement when I was speaking about Lunenburg, but the statement I made about Lunenburg stands good. This is the programme made out during the winter of what the government wanted to do at that time. They figured that $600,000 would cover it. They found, with all the demands that were made, that more money was required for dredging and they came here to get it. When they came to work the matter out, so that the government dredge could be in that place or in this place, they found that it would pay them better, in order to get the work actually done, to call for tenders at Lunenburg, the work at which at that time they may have thought they could accomplish by the government dredge. This is merely a case of allocation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think it is. The minister will see that in the statement of the

Minister of Public Works, Lunenburg is included for 200,000 cubic yards in the appropriation of $600,000. In my hon. friend's statement to the committee to-night, if I remember the figure, he said that the quantity at Lunenburg was 102,000 to 103,000 cubic yards. If 200,000 cubic yards were included in the $600,000 in the Main Estimates, that certainly more than included the 102,000 cubic yards that he speaks of as the total dredging to be done there over a period of three years. It staggers one to find a further Supplementary Estimate of $25,000 for dredging in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I intimated earlier in the evening that my hon. friend was developing some new qualities. My hon. friend is endeavouring to lead the committee to believe that in the item that was given on March 9, dredging in Lunenburg was included. That is not correct.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is as I understood it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Oh, as my hon. friend understood it!

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I am mistaken, I am ready to be put right.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is here is not dredging at Lunenburg, but dredging at Riverport, Lunenburg county, an entirely different place where the dredging is being done by the government dredge.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The House did not have that explanation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend might know very well when he saw that, that it was not Lunenburg but Riverport, Lunenburg county, and my hon. friend was either misleading the committee—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not know, and my hon. friend himself has only discovered this after a great deal of discussion in the House. He passed it over in the earlier part of the discussion, without ever seeing it. I am glad he has given us the explanation, but it took him a long time to do it, although he is himself from Nova Scotia and has charge of the estimates. It would strike anyone as being very extraordinary that after having voted several specific items we should be called upon now for another $25,000.

Mr. FIELDING: It being twelve o'clock I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate advising this House that the Senate do insist upon their amendments made to Bill No. 84, an act to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, for the following reasons:

1. Because the provisions of the act should be equally applicable to employer and employee.
2. Because the selection of the third arbitrator by the chief justice of a court would remove any possible objection that the person selected might be more closely associated with either one of the contending parties.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST AND SECOND READING

Bill No. 251 (from the Senate), for the relief of Flossie May Pinkham.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF—ORGANIZATION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to recommend to the House that the organization of the staff of the House of Commons, adopted by the House on June 20, 1922, be amended by making the changes set out in the details which I am laying on the table.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move, seconded by Mr. Fielding, that the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid on the Table of this House, respecting certain changes in the organization of the staff of the House of Commons, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, June 29, 1923.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

MINES AND MINERALS

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton) moved:

That the third and final report of the Committee on Mines and Minerals be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Mr. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce) moved:

That the second and final report of the special committee appointed to inquire into the operation of Chapter 12, 8-9, George V, an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada, be concurred in.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The report of this committee was placed before the House only a day or two ago. It contains a number of recommendations and is somewhat lengthy, and I doubt if hon. members of the House other than those who were members of the committee have had an opportunity to study it carefully. Among the recommendations there is, for example, an important one suggesting the introduction of a superannuation scheme. The report says:

Your committee is of the opinion that the adoption of a superannuation scheme substantially on the lines of that above described would remove one of the greatest deterrents to efficiency and curtailment of staffs in many of the departments of the public service and it therefore recommends that such a scheme be adopted by parliament at the earliest possible date.

In reference to that recommendation I may say that were it contemplated that the House should continue in session for any considerable time the government would be prepared to bring down forthwith a superannuation bill along the lines suggested by the committee. But as there will hardly be time to consider as important legislation as that at the present session, I may say that at the beginning of next session the government will be prepared to present to parliament a bill along the lines of the recommendations made. As to the other recommendations, some of them are of a minor character; some of them require a little more careful consideration, and I think it is only right that the government as well as hon. members should have an oportunity to go into them very thoroughly during the recess. I would not like to say at the moment that they will all be adopted or that any of them will be adopted; the disposition of the government would be to meet the wishes of the committee as far as appears to be in the public interest. With this assurance, Mr. Speaker, I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion for the adoption of the report, but will allow the report to remain on the Table.

Motion withdrawn.

REDISTRIBUTION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): May I ask the government if an opportunity will be given to consider order No. 39, which has to do with Bill No. 15, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons? The report was tabled yesterday by the chairman of that committee.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou, Acting Minister of National Defence): My hon. friend spoke to me yesterday in regard to this matter. A motion for the adoption of the report will be made later in the day or tomorrow morning. I will let my hon. friend know.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Will there be an opportunity to discuss this—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is quite impossible for anyone at this end of the chamber to know what business is being carried on in the House. It is impossible to hear what is being said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think in view of what the hon. member says the last conversation at least might be repeated.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have no idea of what it is about.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is aware that queries are usually put at this stage, and perhaps he will hear better in future if he moves up. What I was saying in reference to the matter of moving the adoption of the report of the Redistribution committee—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If I might interrupt, I heard neither the question nor the answer

An hon. MEMBER: That is true.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is rather early in the morning, and the auditory part of my hon. friend's make-up is probably not working. The hon. member for Last Mountain—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the privilege of knowing what is going on in this House. At this end we cannot hear what is said in the tone that has been used this morning.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am anxious that the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) and all other members should hear my question. It was, whether the government would give the House an opportunity of discussing order No. 39 which has to do with the report from the special committee appointed to deal with Bill No. 15, an Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In reply I stated to my hon. friend that a motion would be made for the adoption of the report either later in the day or to-morrow, of which I would give my hon. friend notice.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to return to the order of motions for the purpose of laying a return on the table?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The acoustic properties of the House are far better this year than they were last, and I do not see why the members should have to strain their voices to be heard by the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We cannnot hear at all down here.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS

Supplementary Estimates, 1923-4—Harbours and rivers—Ontario, $2,860,090.06.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I find some astonishing items in this vote, but no worse than practically all the rest of these estimates. I was not here when these estimates were first submitted, but I want to say now that the conduct of the government in submitting estimates of $14,700,000 accompanied by other commitments that aggregate at least $70,000,000 or more, probably $170,000,000 in the last week of the session is an affront to parliament, an affront to the country. To say that it is a blazing violation of their own professions when they were seeking office is, of course, only to repeat what everybody now knows. So bad indeed is it that I understand their own followers not far from here have expressed disgust and resisted their conduct; indeed, cast it out the door. The fact of bringing in estimates of this character and pretending that they can get consideration at the hands of the House when we are a few hours from prorogation, a few days at the most before they ever come down—and those days crowded with legislation the most important of any submitted the whole session, more important than all that the government has submitted to parliament in all the five months of the session—is a reflection of the character of the administration and the way it is serving this country.

I would ask particularly for some statement as to what is to be spent on the second item. The first I do not know just where it is, but what is to be done in the way of harbour improvements at Belle River?

[Mr. Johnston.]

Mr. HEALY: As the town of Belle River is in the constituency I come from I may take it upon myself to answer the right hon. leader of the Opposition. This is the only port on that shore of lake St. Clair. It is used at the present time for the distribution of gravel which goes to build the provincial highways and the county roads in this district. Every government for the past twenty years has wasted money on this harbour by attempting to keep it open without putting in any permanent protection. This vote provides for a permanent protection on one side of the harbour. It may be necessary that both sides of the harbour be permanently protected. If so I am going to advocate doing that work. This locality has been the centre of a fishing industry. And there is a great demand for gravel and sand there. The people of that district are entitled to have this harbour protected, the expenditure is justified in every way, and the total capital invested will pay for itself in two years by the amount of gravel and sand used. Every municipal and provincial purpose in the district will be served by this improvement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell us just what is intended to be done under this vote? The hon. member for the riding tells us there is to be some protection on one side of the harbour, and that he hopes it will go on to the other side, and that this expenditure will pay. I should like to know just the basis of it. I think we are all the more entitled to know because there has been a recent by-election there, and it is just possible that this vote has some relation to that election. One might almost imagine that, at least. I never had representations made to me as to the business value of this investment, in fact I think I had representations that were quite the contrary—that this is a purely political placing of money in order to take care of political obligations.

Mr. HEALY: I would be very pleased to answer the leader of the Opposition, in fact I am glad he has brought up the subject of the election at this time. We of the locality were delighted to have a visit from the leader of the Opposition. I am sorry, but I think his attitude in regard to this vote represents, perhaps, the disappointment he felt over the result of the election. I am also sorry that the applause my right hon. friend received in this very town of Belle River did not represent the real feeling of the people. When

distinguished gentlemen such as the leader of the Opposition visit our locality we attempt to show them every respect; and the party to which my right hon. friend belongs went so far as to hire, or have donated, about twenty-five automobiles. They filled these with political friends and made a tour through the county. If I were to use an expression common in theatrical circles I might say that those who followed the right hon. gentleman on that occasion were professional claqueurs. At any rate I can inform him that the applause he received on his visit to Belle River came from the gentlemen who followed him from the city of Windsor, and other places, and did not emanate from the people of Belle River. Consequently, when the election resulted as it did the right hon. gentleman was disappointed, because he had been received with applause and the vote did not bear out that applause. I also wish to thank the leader of the Opposition for the many speeches he made in this district during the election. He orated, I think, from milkstands and in town halls and in school houses—I do not think he spoke from any barns, but he did speak from nearly every other description of building in the riding. When I advocated this very vote which was then proposed, for an improvement so urgently needed, he said, I believe, that it was log rolling. I do not like to make that statement, for this reason. During the by-election the leader of the Opposition sought to have the press correct so many statements published about what he said that I am afraid he will call upon me to make a retraction. However, I will leave it to the right hon. gentleman if he did not use that term on the occasion referred to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the term?

Mr. HEALY: "Log rolling."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very probably I did.

Mr. HEALY: Well, I am awfully glad to get that acknowledgement from you at least. As far as this vote is concerned, the people of this locality are entitled to it. My information is that it makes a breakwater on one side of this harbour and gives eleven or twelve feet of water thus permitting coal to be brought in through the channel, also the sand and gravel needed in the locality which comes in under a contract made with the Dominion government. I may say that the provincial government insists on sand and gravel being furnished to the people of the locality at a cost of forty or fifty cents a yard less than they can buy it from private individuals. The engineer has reported on this work, the late representative for the riding was in favour of it, and this expenditure is justified in every way. I will take the responsibility for this vote because I, not the leader of the Opposition, represent the riding. I repeat that it is justified in every way and I am going to insist on it going through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sure the House must have been impressed with the exceedingly argumentative and able presentation of the business value of this investment made by the member for North Essex. He says that I am very much disappointed that this vote is in the estimates. No, I am not disappointed in the least, I fully expected this vote; I had every reason to expect it. Nor was I very much disappointed in the result. I wonder if the hon. member feels that a great tribute was paid the government of the day by the vote in North Essex. I am not usually in the habit of arguing that election results are a reason against any public action. I leave that to those who can find no real reasons; but when the hon. member for North Essex—

Mr. HEALY: I understood you to say that this was a political appropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and I will show a little reason for that in a moment. I leave the mere boasting of votes to those who are not competent to advance any other argument. But when a majority is reduced from 7,195 to about 1,000 it takes a pretty self-satisfied representative to initiate the subject himself in the Commons as a matter of self-congratulation. No, I am not disappointed in this vote being introduced. When I used the word "political" I used the most euphemistic adjective I could think of. During the campaign the promise of a vote of this kind was the chief argument on behalf of the hon. member. Indeed, I can recall no other. As for correcting press misrepresentations, the correction I made was against the Minister of Finance and I made it out of a Liberal paper. The report of the Liberal newspaper of Windsor was right but the Minister of Finance was all wrong. He based his statement on some contortion appearing in the Globe from the Canadian Press, and I have in my office an apology from the Canadian Press for making a wrong report. So much for that. What has that to do with the proposition?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the hon. member takes the castigation that these "hear, hears" imply.

Mr. HEALY: You started the political discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and I intend to end it. I hold in my hand a poster containing the announcement of this harbour improvement. This is the first of the literary efforts of the hon. gentleman's friends in regard to this marked achievement at the expense of the taxpayer. I will read it:

Vote for Healey
and get
$86,000 Gov. Docks
and Breakwater
$25,000 Waterworks
Free gift from James Cooper.
$75,000 Brick and Tile Yard
to employ 30 hands the year round.
Vote for Robinson and get nothing but hot air.
King needs Tim; so do you.
Tim and King—that is the thing.

This is worth repeating. Of course it is illegal and it is a violation of the law which this government is sworn to obey; published without a statement as to who publishes it, but it is published on behalf of the member, by the man whose name appears here, and who is chief henchman in the riding. Everyone knows who he is. Everyone knows what he did to elect the hon. member and all about it.

Vote for Healy and get $86,000 government docks.

The note is maturing now and the country is paying for it.

And the breakwater; and the $25,000 waterworks—when that is to come is a matter, of course, in the hands of the gods—and, I suppose, of Tim. The information I have—and it comes from the people of Belle River—is that this is utterly worthless, that it is chiefly for the personal benefit of the man who got out the dodger and for the political benefit of the representative of the riding. This vote is brought down the last few days of the session. I have a letter, which I will have here shortly, which deals with this matter. It is dated the 24th March, just a few days after the election, and states that the Liberals are now boasting that a vote of—I forget how many thousand dollars—will be in the estimates, but not in the main estimates. It will be held for the supplementaries, in order to carry out this pledge to the people, held till the last few days of the session so as to be jammed through in the dying moments, because "King needs Tim; Tim and King, that is the thing."

Mr. JACOBS: It would be interesting to have that letter read.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had it here a day or two ago, thinking this matter would come up then. I will get the letter; the hon. member need not worry. And I have two or three others. This is no worse than the rest of the administration of this government. It is just of a piece with all the rest. This is how they purpose to carry these estimates, with appropriations of the money of the people of Canada, looking to the by-elections that will probably be held this summer. I have often wondered what it is going to cost the Dominion to provide a Liberal successor for the prospective judge of the Exchequer Court? This is part of the cost of having this House adorned by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Healy). The information I have—and I believe it is correct—is from citizens of the town, that this is chiefly for the benefit of the man who got out the dodger and for his business and in pursuance of his pledge, contained in an illegal dodger, to elect illegally the hon. member.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The records of the Department of Public Works show that my right hon. friend is very unjust to the member for North Essex. The record here shows that this matter was first brought to the attention of the Department of Public Works during the lifetime of the late lamented Hon. Mr. Kennedy by a resolution dated 7th April, 1922, of the municipal council of the township of Rochester, concurring with the village of Belle River and other municipalities re the urgency of the Belle River improvements. Later there was a letter from the Reeve of Belle River stating:

That this is the only place on North shore of Essex county which could be made fit for a port and is the logical place for distribution of coal, gravel, etc., resulting in a saving of $5 a ton on coal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. member give the House any information of the chief article that is included in the word "etc."?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am reading from the representations which were made by the reeve of Belle River—and I take it that that gentleman is a man of responsibility, and that the municipal council of the township of Rochester, who verify what the reeve of Belle River says, are also responsible. I think this House, recalling the late Minister of Railways who promoted this matter long before there was any election to fill the vacancy occasioned by his lamented death, will hardly credit my right hon. friend with all he says as to the reason of the vote being due to the by-election. The reeve of Belle River stated:

A tile and brick yard is building which will use 2,000 tons of coal a year, in addition to other in-

dustries. It would re-establish the local fleet of sand boats which used to operate from here and have had to lie idle on account of the mouth of the river filling up.

The record shows that this little discussion about the North Essex by-election had no relation whatever to the consideration of this question by the Department of Public Works. The local municipality of Belle River, and the municipal council of which it formed a part, and the late Hon. Mr. Kennedy, had been pressing this matter, on the Department of Public Works, on behalf of the locality and the constituency, long before the death of the late minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it a dock or a piece of a dock? Or what is it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I should have thought my right hon. friend ought to have known a little more about it before he denounced everybody indiscriminately.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just know what is here. I am asking what the vote is for.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will give the hon. member the information, if he will wait and forget there was a hand-bill and a North Essex election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not forget it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): One of the troubles of my right hon. friend is that he belongs to that school of people known as the Bourbons. The work here is:

To construct 1,500 lineal feet double sheet pile wall, consisting of double three-inch sheeting for the length of 1,000 feet, and double 4-inch sheeting for the length of 500 feet, sheeting to be from eight to twenty feet in length, securely walled to round piles on each side of sheeting placed at 5-foot centres; also seven round pile stone filled cribs, 18 feet by 18 feet in area.

The memo I have reads:

The original estimated cost of this work was $72,500, the sheet pile wall being estimated at $60,000 sufficient to provide for an ultimate depth in the channel of 18 feet; but after further consideration it was decided that a wall to provide for the maintenance of a 10-foot channel would meet the requirements for some time to come at the above greatly reduced cost.

Mr. HOCKEN: Perhaps the minister could tell us whether the merchandise which comes in under the heading "etc." comes in by motor boat.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am not versed as to the Ontario Temperance Act operation or matters of that kind. Perhaps my hon. friend would know more about that.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not live there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am giving to the House the information from the Department of Public Works coming from sources I have indicated, and this is to justify the expenditure which has been made there. Everyone is aware of the movement of the sand and the important business that has grown up in gravel along lake St. Clair. I am free to say that the record I have, showing the representations made by responsible people in the constituency and the efforts of the late Hon. Mr. Kennedy to have this matter dealt with before he departed, is so clear that it cannot be doubted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understand from what my hon. friend says, that the basis of this appropriation is representations made by the former member, the Hon. Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): And the reeve of Belle River and the municipal council.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who joined with him in those representations, as I understand the matter. What possible excuse is there for this delay? We were told before that the reason why these supplementaries were bought down now was that there was no time to include them in the Main Estimates. Now we have something which, on the confession of the minister, is old, hoary, with nothing at all done recently to draw it to the attention of the government. The only excuse and reason for the late date of these supplementaries is that the matter could not be considered before. The government, on their own showing and their own admission, show that they have deliberately delayed the submission of this appropriation for the purpose of these supplementaries.

Mr. FIELDING: Might I add a word of comment on the first part of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen)? He said that it is an affront to parliament and the Canadian people to bring down estimates of this character at this late stage. I wonder if the word "effrontery" is a matter of parliamentary privilege. I am afraid it is not, and therefore I shall have to substitute a more moderate word. If I were not so familiar with the methods of my right hon. friend in dealing with public questions in this House, I would be amazed at the audacity of the statement he made to-day. The right hon. gentleman waxed indignant in the words he uttered to-day, and he repeated what he said a few days before in the evening when these estimates came down. He said "I

would like the minister to tell where in the history of Canada"—a pretty large story—"estimates of that magnitude were ever brought down in the last week of the session." If my right hon. friend had been here last night, he would have had the information which he apparently had neglected to obtain. He is indignant because we in these last days of the session have brought down estimates of $15,000,000. In the last session of the government of my right hon. friend, the session of 1921, and in the last week of that session, to use the very words he used, they brought down estimates of $23,000,000. At that time the Main Estimates were not all through the House, but that point is not important. According to the records, the message was brought down on a Monday, but, as a matter of fact, it was brought down in the small hours of Tuesday morning, according to my information, and the House prorogued on Saturday. They used all the machinery to crowd those estimates through the House. What can the country think of the right hon. gentleman who, in parliament, is virtuously indignant because we bring down estimates amounting to $15,000,000, and who challenges anybody to show anything of the kind in the history of Canada, when the record shows that he brought down in the last week of the session of 1921 estimates amounting to $23,000,000. It is things like this which prevent the public from having confidence in the statements of the right hon. gentleman. It is his utterly reckless manner of discussing public affairs which has tended to discredit him and to put him in the position which he now occupies.

Let me again repeat what the Prime Minister (Mr. Makenzie King) said the other day. There is no desire to rush these estimates through. If this House desires time to consider them, time shall be given, so far as the government is concerned. There will be no closure to crowd these estimates through, there will be no coercion—nothing that is not consistent with the principles of sound parliamentary government and free discussion. But when the right hon. gentleman indignantly challenges anyone to show when, in the history of all Canada, a government had brought down estimates of this magnitude in the last week of a session, and I point out the fact that, in the last week of the session of 1921, he brought down estimates amounting to $23,000,000, I think the right hon. gentleman will come to the conclusion that, perhaps, he had better think before he speaks.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to wait until hon. gentlemen have a good chance to get this off their chests, because they will get a rude disappointment in a moment. When I spoke the other day as I spoke to-day, I referred to all the government was committing the country to this last week.

Mr. FIELDING: No. His challenge was: "When did a government bring down Supplementary Estimates like this in the last week?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think we ever did. Those estimates were nothing like the length of these, nor were the commitments of the last week of that session a fraction of what this government has brought down this last week. The minister himself is responsible for coming to this House and keeping out of the estimates, an amount which, I believe, will run to over $100,000,000. He brings this down in the last week of the session, and merely because it is in separate bills, he says that it is not estimates. The conduct of the minister, instead of being more to be commended on that account, is on that very account the most discreditable to a government in the history of our country. This government this week is down, in the dying hours of the session, with commitments that will run to $150,000,000 to this Dominion—commitments so preposterous that his own followers, not far from him, some of them the most loyal he ever had, have cast them ignominiously out of the door. That is where the government stands. What does the minister think of this kind of conduct? The minister says: "Oh, you have plenty of time; we are in no hurry." In the last week of 1921, I stood as Prime Minister and told the House that all the time the House wanted would be given to consider the estimates we had, and that was all we had. There was no closure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there was.

Mr. VIEN: There were sittings all night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, there were sittings all night, but I am satisfied they were not on the estimates. That does not matter anyway; there was plenty of time given for consideration of the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The vote for the Merchant Marine was put through under closure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not an estimate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not a supplementary estimate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It represented an expenditure of $70,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was in the Main Estimates. The question was considered for days, and there was no hurry whatever. Hon. members stood up and asked us to put on the closure. That was what they were asking for. That was what they were keeping us all night for. It was the greatest bluff that was ever put up. During the last week of that session I said that all the time wanted would be given for the consideration of what was brought down, and there was not a fraction or, at least, only a small fraction, of the commitments that this government has brought down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did not the right hon. gentleman each evening resist strenuously the request of the opposition to adjourn at twelve o'clock, so that time might be given for proper discussion of the estimates? Did he not keep the House in session until the early hours of the morning, refusing any opportunity to consider them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has this government not kept us sitting until the early hours of the morning?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it has not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This House has sat in the morning time and time again.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The House this session, and last, has not sat past eleven o'clock a single night without the consent of every member; and during the discussion of estimates, the minute there has been a request that the House should adjourn, and if there has been any indication that that was the wish of hon. members, the House has adjourned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am prepared to admit that the opposition has been much more reasonable than was the opposition of that day. The opposition of that day kept the talk going merely in order that they might force closure if they possibly could, and even in certain cases they got up and asked for it. That was the character of the opposition then, and I do not see that there has been much improvement now that those of that opposition have come into power.

On this estimate, in reply to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), who did not think I had the letter, I will read now from a letter I have from a private citizen of Belle River. This is dated the 24th March, the date I gave the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Who signed it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated that it was a private letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some hon. members think it would be of great value to know the name. Do they think I have not the letter?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely under the rules of the House an hon. member may not read part of a letter, which he makes public by the reading, and then say that the rest is private.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He can.

Mr. GRAHAM: He might by following the example of some of my right hon. friend's followers in Toronto. But it is a rule of the House that any document from which a quotation is made must be laid on the Table.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a rule, which I think my hon. friend has been in the House long enough to know, that if a member of the government quotes from a government document that document must be laid upon the Table. There is no rule that every member must divulge the name of a private citizen because he wishes to read from any letter written by such a person. Even if he quotes from the letter he is at liberty to divulge the name or not, as he sees fit, and that principle has been acted on time and time again.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member knows better than that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that what I have stated is absolutely correct. However, I have no particular objection to disclosing the name if I can obtain the consent of the writer to do so. But I will not give the name until I do obtain that consent.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not objecting to the fact that my hon. friend does not give the name. I do object, however, as I think I have a right to object, to his making public a part of a letter which he says is private and asking us to take it for granted that the letter is from some citizen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. member be good enough to recall the incident? I did not say I was going to read from the letter until the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) inquired whether I had it, suggesting, I think, that I read from it. Now I am only answering his challenge.

Mr. FIELDING: Apart from the point of order, which I do not raise, does my right

hon. friend not admit that the force of a letter must be drawn from the signature? And if the right hon. gentleman reads a private letter—his right to do which I am not questioning—surely he must realize that no one will pay respectful attention to it if its source is concealed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not very material to me whether I read the letter or not, but when I am challenged by an hon. member to read it and I am ready to do so it does seem strange, to say the least, that the same hon. gentlemen should raise an objection. However, I think the country will draw the same inference from the objection as it would draw from the letter, if I read it.

Mr. JACOBS: The most important part of the letter would be the signature of the person who wrote it. It might have been dictated to an office boy, or an office boy might have written to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The signature appears on the letter; there is no doubt about that; and I have so much respect for it that I am ready to disclose the name to my hon. friend. These are some of the words it contains:

The Liberals here seem confident that a government dock will be built at Belle River this year, and state that the cost of same is to be included in the Supplemental Estimates.

The date of the letter is March 24, 1923. I have further communications to the effect that while some dredging, so as to allow a certain depth, could be justified, the work the government contemplates cannot be justified on any business ground whatever.

Mr. CAHILL: Are they signed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are signed, just as all letters are signed. I thought the hon. gentleman had attained a business eminence that would have acquainted him with that fact. Now, this is merely the payment of a political debt.

Mr. CAHILL: Anyone could write letters of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will move that the vote be reduced by $30,000. The fact that the debt is a fulfilment of a bribe is sufficient to nullify it in the judgment of the House. The hon. minister (Mr. Macdonald) says that someone wrote about the matter before the election. I do not doubt that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Pardon me; I did not say that someone wrote about it before the election. I stated that this municipality had passed a resolution concerning the matter and that there was a communication from the reeve of the municipality on the same subject. I further pointed out that the late Hon. Mr. Kennedy, for over a year before he departed this life, had been dealing with the question with the Public Works department. The committee will see how my hon. friend argues. He said that I made the statement that someone had written about the matter before the election. What I said was precisely what I have just stated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some one had written; the reeve, I think, wrote about the matter. The minister states that a resolution was passed by the municipal council, and that is the justification for going on with the work. Well, you can get resolutions of council for anything; and anyone who publishes a poster such as the one I have read, and has the ingenuity of the man that did it, can engineer such a resolution, even if it is to his own advantage to have the money spent in the municipality that passes the resolution. What I note is that the only commitment made was made when the by-election was on. There was no commitment made by the Hon. Mr. Kennedy; it was made as a bribe at the time of the by-election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the bribe is now being paid. I shall move that the item be reduced by $30,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): On this question my right hon. friend is speaking recklessly. The evidence points conclusively to the fact that the matter was initiated the same as any other public work of importance in any locality originates. It was first dealt with by the local authorities over a year ago, and I can inform the committee that there had been improvements at Belle River, but owing to a movement of the sand 12 noon the proposed wall extension became imperative. The municipality considered the matter and it was placed before the late Mr. Kennedy long before there was any probability of his death or the possibility of any by-election. There is some question that this matter should have been brought down in the Main Estimates. The Main Estimates were laid on the Table immediately after the opening of the session, on the 1st of February, and the death of Mr. Kennedy did not occur until after that date, so that the by-election did not take place until March. Let me read what the engineer reports:

Wall extension proposed is of a public nature. Local municipality wishes to have entrance channel

redredged and proposed protection work constructed to permit bringing in coal, lumber and building materials, the carrying on and development of fishing industry and the taking out of sugar beets by water to Wallaceburg and Chatham. They have also asked for proposed extension to west pier to prevent the prevailing westerly winds from filling up bar across entrance to channel. New brick and tile works under construction and to be placed in operation at this point.

This shows why, beyond all question, the Department of Public Works took the matter into consideration. Having gone through the various reports touching these items, I am struck forcibly by this fact, that in these estimates there is no item behind which there is such an accumulation of evidence to establish an independent interest in behalf of the municipal and local authorities as in the case of this particular item. My hon. friend cannot forget that there was an election in North Essex or that bills were posted in that campaign, and for that reason we have had this exhibition this morning.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the date of the engineer's report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not the exact date; it is not in the record. The deputy tells me it would be about two months ago.

Mr. HEALY: Really the merits of this vote have been lost sight of in the political discussion that has arisen upon it. The first knowledge I had of any vote, or of any work proposed at Belle River, came to me one night when I was attending a meeting there. I was confronted with the engineer's report and a letter written by the late Minister of Railways in which statements were made that the people of the district were desirous that the work should be gone on with; and the vote mentioned in the poster was $86,000. I made the statement that any promise made by the late Minister of Railways would be carried out so far as my influence could bring about this end. I made that statement then and I stand by it now. And this is the only opportunity I had of getting anything placed in the estimates, because I was not elected until the first of March. The letters with reference to this matter are contained in the files of the Public Works department and if my right hon. friend wishes to secure the information he can consult them. He can see the letters written by the late Minister of Railways as well as the report of the engineer and that of the municipality. The vote is entirely justifiable. It may be true that the handbill was circulated in the district, but I want to tell the leader of the Opposition that it was the first circular I had ever seen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have some others.

Mr. HEALY: I heard that such a circular was published, and the wording of it follows the wording of a circular that was used extensively by the leader of the Opposition. There is no doubt in my mind that the gentleman who wrote the circular considered that, while the effect would be different in this case, the phraseology was quite appropriate.

Now, I am not responsible for that circular. As a matter of fact the whole proposition comes from a squabble between two gentlemen who lived in Belle River, two gentlemen, I believe, who got into trouble between themselves over a shipment of goods that came into Belle River. One gentleman happens to be a strong Liberal; the other happens to be a strong Conservative. That is the secret of the whole thing. That accounts for the letters being produced. That accounts for this poor little vote for the poor little town of Belle River, which happens to be in the north riding of Essex, being attacked by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. A local political squabble, and it is brought up here at this time. The vote is justified; the people are entitled to it. They have been recognized by every government of this country for twenty years, but it is the first time that an intelligent effort has been made to put money where it belongs, where it will make a permanent improvement at a small cost, thus avoiding the expenditure of large amounts each year on dredging. This expenditure has been reduced from $86,000 to $30,000 at my own insistence. I conferred with the engineer and with the people of the district, and decided that a breakwater costing this amount would do the work as well as a larger expenditure. Any member of the House who knows the locality, or who would agree to visit the locality, would come to the same conclusion.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. leader of the Opposition is the happy possessor of many good qualities to which I freely offer the tribute of admiration. Unfortunately, like most of us, I suppose, there are some qualities on the other side, and one of his unfortunate habits is that when his mistakes—I use the word very mildly—are pointed out, instead of frankly admitting them he runs off at a tangent and tries to divert attention; he adopts the policy of abusing somebody else. It is not a good policy for any man, least of all is it

a good policy for a man holding the distinguished position of leader of the Opposition. Now, what was the issue? The right hon. gentleman said, two or three days ago, that the bringing down of these supplementary estimates—and he held them up and flourished them—was an affront to the people of Canada, an outrage, an incomprehensible thing. Now, we are not discussing the broader question of all the expenditure, if necessary we can still discuss that before the House closes; but we are confining our discussion to this particular point: The bringing down of these supplementary estimates at a late stage in the session—just that and nothing more. This is what the right hon. gentleman said, flourishing the estimates above his head:

> Well, the House is faced to-night, two or three or four days before prorogation, with a set of estimates almost as big as the estimates that were produced in the middle of the session—estimates, page after page of them, that we ought to have had before us for weeks, even for months, before prorogation. I would like the minister to tell where in the history of Canada estimates of that magnitude were ever brought down in the last week of the session. Occasionally there would be a single page and that would be all, and there would be a row over that.

That is the statement I am challenging. May I point out that the right hon. gentleman in his own last session of parliament, three or four days before prorogation—to use his own words, in the last week of the session—brought down estimates not for $15,000,000, but for $23,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman the Estimates with him?

Mr. FIELDING: No; but is my right hon. friend challenging the accuracy of my statement? Now, I quoted the Montreal Gazette before on another matter and he was not pleased; he does not like the authority of the Montreal Gazette. But here is a quotation from that paper:

> Supplementary estimates tabled in the House this evening by Sir Henry Drayton, Minister of Finance, totalled $23,959,000.

This is from the Montreal Gazette of May 21, 1921. Someone now hands me a copy of those Estimates; I did not have them at hand. I suppose my right hon. friend would like to say I imagined it. Here are the Estimates; but I am willing to take the Montreal Gazette's statement of the total without reading the document.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He will deny even the Estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: I want to say to my right hon. friend in all seriousness that he should not recklessly plunge into these rash statements. He should endeavour to have some regard for his position as ex-Prime Minister of this country and as leader of a political party—a once great party.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, they are going strong.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend, having regard to the position he occupies, should not attempt to mislead the House by rash and reckless statements. Now, here is the only point; he defiantly challenged me to show a case where in the whole history of Canada any minister of finance ever brought down such supplementary estimates in the last week of the session. I do not go back to earlier history; I go to the very last session when the right hon. gentleman was in power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I must congratulate the minister on his energy.

Mr. FIELDING: Thank you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The unfortunate feature is that what he has stated pretty well goes to prove what I said.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We knew it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The estimate that was brought down—indeed, I have not the date in my mind of the closing of parliament, but if the date of the article he read was the twenty-first of May—that is what he read—

Mr. FIELDING: The thirty-first. If I read the twenty-first that was wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister gave it as the twenty-first.

Mr. FIELDING: The thirty-first is the date in the memorandum I have. Parliament prorogued on the fourth of June.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman gave the twenty-first as the date; it would require my looking into it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a point of order. I should like to know whether this discussion is on the item at present before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion is on the general vote, item No. 508, for the province of Ontario. It is being dealt with generally, as agreed by the committee last night; so that the discussion is not on any specific item of the vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am disposed to think that when I get time to go into it—

Mr. FIELDING: Confess and have it over.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no confession from me; the confession will come from the minister—that is to say, if he is honest with himself: I have not the exact date before me, but if the hon. member was right in the date he gave the House the estimates were brought down a long while before the end of the session.

Mr. FIELDING: They were not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But one item of those estimates was a revote of $12,000,000 in connection—

Mr. FIELDING: What difference does it make what the items were?

Mr. MEIGHEN: All the difference in the world.

Mr. FIELDING: The amount of the estimates was the question. What is the difference what they are?

Mr. MEIGHEN: All the difference in the world, even considering, as the minister insists on doing, that all we are comparing are the supplementary estimates of ours and the supplementary estimates of his, which are only a fraction of all that he has asked this House to put through in the last few days, only a fraction of the appropriations that he has concealed from the House under the cover of supplemental bills. One item of those estimates of ours was a revote of $12,000,000 loaned to the provinces—loaned, mark you—for housing. The hon. member will find it—a revote of $10,456,000—on page 4552 of Hansard of the 4th June.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out to my hon. friend that $4,000,000 of these Supplementary Estimates is for the same purpose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Four million is very different from twelve million. That leaves only ten million and a fraction. I have not had time to go through it and see the rest, but I notice it is a whole lot less to be considered and covers a whole lot less for parliament than does their Supplementary Estimate alone. It is merely a small portion of the size and consists in the main of items which parliament had already considered and which are merely loans—a different thing altogether. I put myself in the judgment of the House if ever the conduct of this government in trying to gulp down these tremendous vast amounts and present a whole new area for consideration in the last few days was ever equalled in the history of this or any other parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I just take the words with which my hon. friend has concluded when he asks if ever in the history of this country there had been an effort made to gulp down such a vast amount as we are presenting at the present time? Fortunately it is possible to refer to the records of parliament in this matter and put the whole question beyond dispute. I have in my hand the Journals of the House for the last year in which my right hon. friend was Prime Minister, and I am going to ask the attention of the House to what took place in this House on the last three days of the session while my right hon. friend was Prime Minister and his colleague was Minister of Finance. This is the record of what was considered by the House on Wednesday 1st June, 1921, and I would ask the House to remember that parliament was prorogued that year on Saturday, 4th June. Here is what was forced on the House and forced through parliament on that day. I shall read only some of the items appearing under miscellaneous:

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income—Miscellaneous—Board of Railways Commissioners, $206,000.

Other items, $200,000, $5,000, $53,000, $10,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those were in the Main Estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, but parliament never had an opportunity of considering the Main Estimates until the Wednesday prior to prorogation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because you obstructed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will permit me I should like to read this list. I think it will amaze even himself. The other items are as follows:

Loan of $50,0000,000 to the Canadian National Railways.

Loan of $89,000,000 to the Grand Trunk.

Loan of $26,000,000 to the Grand Trunk System.

There were several other miscellaneous items and finally this:

To provide salaries and expenses in connection with an arbitration of the railways, $1,000,000.

There are a couple of hundred million dollars, in these items alone, put through this House within a few hours by the force of the majority which my right hon. friend had and the manner in which he used it. But this is only a fraction. Other items put through on the same day were as follows:

Canadian Government Railways, Railways and Canals, $7,000,000; Canals—staff and repairs, $2,270,000; Railways and Canals—to pay claims for right of way,

$35,000; Miscellaneous railway equipment, $1,903,000; Hudson Bay Railway—Port Nelson terminals, $100,000.

Supplementary Estimates—Railways and Canals—chageable to income, $20,500; To increase the amount of loan authorized by vote 478, $1,520,000.

There were other items $1,000, $200,000, $24,000, $10,000, $50,000.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Canadian Government Railways, $2,000,000.

Civil Government—Department of Railways and Canals, $1,800, $1,500.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—various items for the railways as follows: $3,000, $1,400, $97,000, $4,500 $70,000, $50,000, $47,500, $50,000.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income—Railways, $80,000, $50,000, $130,000.

That was the day's work for Wednesday, and the records of the House show that it adjourned at 1.55 a.m.—practically two o'clock in the morning. As I recall that day most of these estimates were passed between the hour of midnight and two o'clock in the morning against the strenuous protests of the Opposition, and the items ran into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Now as to the next day, Thursday. The House according to the Journals sat until 3.20 in the morning. That was to jam through a whole lot of other legislation. Estimates were not touched on that day. But on Friday, though parliament was prorogued on the following day, in addition to a great deal of legislation that was jammed through, the following estimates were also passed—I am giving only the round figures.

Main Estimates—Scientific Institutions—Department of Interior, $55,000, $14,000; Geodetic Survey, $325,000; International boundaries, $37,000; Government of the Northwest Territories, $125,000, $70,000; Government of the Yukon Territory, $35,000, $45,000, $20,000, $20,000; Dominion Lands and Parks—salaries—outside service, $515,000, $250,000, $600,000, $2,000; Protection of timber in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $1,000,000; Other items, $4,000, $367,000, $15,000, $284,000, $300,000, $1,000, $800,000, $60,000, $105,000, $10,000, $1,500, $1,000, $500,000, $325,000.

Supplementary Estimates—Civil Government—Department of Interior, $57,000; Government of the Northwest Territories, $30,000; Dominion Lands and Parks, $40,000, $3,000, $65,000.

Main Estimates—Indians, $23,000.

Supplementary Estimates—Mines and Geological Survey, $140,000, $140,000.

Main Estimates—Indians, $23,000.

Supplementary Estimates—Indians, $200, $300, $19,000, $8,000, $19,000, $6,000, $1,000, $5,000, $5,000, $9,000, $5,000, $12,000, $4,000, $9,000; Agriculture—for purchase of seed grain, $1,500,000; Agriculture—other items, $100,000, $100,000, $100,000, $25,000, $10,000 $300,000, $20,000; Civil Government—Department of Agriculture, $3,900, $1,000, $1,900, $2,000, $2,000.

Main Estimates—charges of management, $100,000, $15,000, $400,000, $100,000, $100,000, $6,000, $3,000, $80,000; Civil government—Governor General, $33,600, $66,600; Privy Council, $38,000, $10,000; Secretary of State, $190,000, $33,500; Mounted Police, $31,500, $9,000; Auditor General, $218,500, $22,000; Finance, $416,000. $50,000; Insurance, $58,000, $50,000; Public Archives, $66,000, $12,000; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, $61,000, $10,000; Civil Service Commission, $192,000, $160,000.

Main estimates—Legislation. Senate, $142,500; House of Commons, $238,800, $77,600, $46,800, $60,000, $141,000; Library of Parliament, $41,900, $18,000, $1,000, $12,500; General, $125,000, $16,000.

Main estimates—Pensions, $1,200, $1,000, $1,000, $30,000, $7,000; Pensions—European War and active militia, $30,500,000; Board of Pension Commissioners, $625,000.

Main estimates—Superannuation, $90,000; the Naval Service, $2,500,000; Labour, $50,000; Civil government, $1,200,000, $156,000; Post Office—outside service, $13,600,000, $10,100,000, $1,000,000, $195,000.

Supplementary Estimates—Civil Government—Post Office Department, $1,000, $9,000, $5,000, $9,000; Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, $19,000; Post-Office—outside service, $365,000; Post Office—miscellaneous, $25,000, $235,000, $3,000, $2,000; Civil Government—Administration of Justice, $10,000; Penitentiaries, $200,000; Civil Government—Post Office Department $15,000; Post Office—outside Service, $86,000;—Mail Service by railway, $4,380,000.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, reading lists of this kind was ruled out of order by you last night.

The CHAIRMAN: The right hon. member is quite in order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wonder my hon. friends are ashamed of the record. In addition to those I have read the following were also passed on that same day:

Supplementary Estimates—Administration of Justice, $2,500, $3,000; Penitentiaries, $10,000; Miscellaneous, $30,000, $5,000, $20,000, $1,000; Demobilization, $6,000.

Main Estimates—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Pay, $1,718,000, Subsistence, $1,800,000, Contingencies, $5,000; Soldiers' Land Settlement, $17,000; Advances to soldiers settling upon the land, $35,000,000; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment: Capital, $200,000; Care of patients, $5,250,000; Vocational expense, $325,000; Salaries, $6,000,000; Pay and allowance (treatment), $3,750,000, (vocational), $2,000,000; Vocational Loans, $150,000; Interest on war service gratuity balances, $10,000; Operating expenses and working capital, $1,500,000; Miscellaneous—Canada Gazette, $51,000; Printing Bureau, $20,000; Distribution of parliamentary documents, $40,000; Miscellaneous printing, $100,000; Contribution towards publication of international catalogue of scientific literature, $600; Expenses under Canada Temperance Act, $500,000; Other items under Miscellaneous, $31,000; $40,000, $68,000, $25,000, $2,000, $6,000, $35,000, $10,000, $50,000, $8,000; to provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, $2,000,000; Other items, $5,000, $5,000 $5,000, $2,000, $8,000, $2,500, $905,316, $3,000, $15,000, $80,442, $15,000, $5,000, $1,000, $15,000, $50,000, $15,640, $2,000, $12,000; Demobilization—Dominion Bureau of Statistics (including census 1921), $1,860,000; Trade and Commerce—Secretary of State, $50,000.

Supplementary Estimates.—Provisional bonus, allowance for inside and outside service of the Civil Service, $9,375,000.

That is as large as the whole of our Supplementary Estimates, exclusive of what is provided by way of loans.

Supplementary Estimates—Charges of Management—Offices of the Assistant Receiver General, etc., $12,000; Printing Dominion notes, $75,000; other items, $60,000, $1,000, $66,000; Civil Government—Printing etc., $1,700,

$4,800, $10,000; Department of Labour—contingencies, $20,000; High Commissioner's office, $7,000; Civil Service Commission, $4,800, $5,120, $10,000, $10,000, $25,000, $10,000; Legislation—Senate, $6,259, $7,800, $9,000, $4,700, $11,000, $8,800; Immigration and Colonization— contingencies in Canadian, British and Foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, $150,000; Exhibitions, $5,000; Pensions—Salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioner for Canada, $350,000; Militia and Defence—Royal Military College, $35,000.

Then follow a number of votes for pensions of different amounts, and a gratuity. Next come these items.

Labour—Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $5,000; Conciliation and Labour Act, $24,000, Emergency relief, $500,000; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—care of patients and limb factory operations, $1,600,000; Unemployment relief, $1,100,000; Miscellaneous—Printing Bureau, $13,000; Grant to Navy League of Canada, $5,000; Administration of the Business Profits War Tax, 1916, and the Income War Tax Act, 1917, $600,000; Expenses under the Naturalization Act, $12,000; Trade and Commerce—Canada Grain Act, Administration of, $60,000; Trade commissioners and commercial agents, $40,000; Weights and Measures, $10,000;

Civil Government—Department Secretary of State.

The items under this head relate to the departments of Secretary of State, Agriculture, Public Works, Trade and Commerce, and include the following amounts: $3,375, $1,125, $2,600, $2,400, $1,890, $1,800, $4,800, $2,880, $1,800, $1,800.

High Commissioner's Office, $7,000; Department of External Affairs, $4,000; Department of Public Archives, $5,500; Civil Service Commission, $7,100; Legislation—Senate, certain sessional indemnities, $3,000; House of Commons, contingencies, $17,000.

There follow other items respecting the House of Commons and the Parliamentary library. Now these items:

Immigration and Colonization, $28,000; Pensions, $700; Militia and Defence, $10,000, $5,000, $20,000, $3,000; Royal Military College, $25,000; Public Works—chargeable to capital, $100,000.

Let me take the votes for public works:

Public works—Nova Scotia, $1,500, $6,000, $3,000, $3,000; Public Works, New Brunswick, $5,000, $1,500; Public works, Quebec, $2,200, $25,000, $1,400, $2,750; Montreal, General Post Office, $30,000; Quebec, Immigration building, $15,000; Quebec, Post Office, $10,000; Quebec, Savard Park Hospital, $10,000; Three Rivers, Public Building, $4,750.

Now the votes for Ontario.

Public works, Ontario, $1,600, $2,600, $30,000, $2,000, $7,500, $1,000, $1,131, $4,000, $25,000, $2,000. $8,500, $2,000, $10,000, $13,000, $3,000, $5,400, $22,000, $9,000, $5,500, $100,000, $10,084, $2,500, $4,500, $350,000, $6,000, $7,500, $4,252.

Other items of public works are:

Public works, Manitoba, $1,300; Public works, Saskatchewan, $7,500; $2,000; $4,500; Public works, Alberta, $3,800, $1,000, $7,000, $2,400; Public works, British Columbia, $14,000, $3,500, $2,175, $6,000, $4,000; Generally—Public works, Armouries, $87,000; Dominion Public Buildings, $30,000; Rents, Repairs, Furniture Heating, etc.— Ottawa Public Buildings, $125,000; Telephone Service, $3,000; Dominion Public Buildings, $60,000.

In the matter of harbours and rivers there is a list of items as long as that presented in our estimates. The estimates for Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick cover a page of the official record for simply harbours and rivers. The items for Quebec and Ontario occupy almost the same. The next page is covered with estimates for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and Yukon territory. The votes for roads and bridges run into many thousands, if not millions. The estimates for British Columbia occupy half a page. The mail subsidies and steamship subventions cover part of a page. For public works chargeable to capital—Marine department—there is a vote of $85,000. There are also votes for lighthouse and coast service, labour, soldiers' civil re-establishment —oustside service—and miscellaneous. There are two votes under soldiers' civil re-establishment one amounting to $600,000 and the other to $623,000. Under miscellaneous there is a vote of $45,000 for the Printing bureau, and one of $24,670 for the Conservation commission.

These items, Mr. Chairman, were passed in the very closing days of the session. I could quote many other items from the record, but I will simply direct the attention of the House to the time at which the House adjourned; it was 5.28 in the morning. My right hon. friend has appealed to his record. Very well, I have given it. If there ever was a worse scandal in the history of parliament in the passing of estimates I should like my right hon. friend to point to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the object of the Prime Minister in making this long and rather wearying harangue must have been to take up as much time and leave as little for consideration and discussion as possible. I do not know what other relevancy his speech had.

Mr. ROBB: We have all next week before us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The estimates enumerated were the main estimates. All that the Prime Minister has been reading had been before parliament for weeks and months; before parliament during weeks and months of persistent obstruction by these same hon. gentlemen in order that at last they could claim that a terrible injustice had been committed in getting them through. Nor was closure passed on that occasion. My hon. friends had the right to discuss those estimates as long as they liked. They had been debated time and time again during the session, and went through the same as other estimates.

Let me recall the facts. The large items were loans to the railways, $75,000,000 and so forth. It will be remembered that those were the cases in which my hon. friends opposite used to make their great speeches against public ownership. When these items were up during the session they took occasion to harangue against the disastrous character of public ownership, and for days and nights they kept this hall ringing with denunciations and the scandal of putting $75,000,000 in the estimates for this public ownership that was going to ruin Canada and bring it to the brink of bankruptcy—yea, push it over the precipice. By such speeches they held up the estimates all the session, and then at the last—with their own consent the same as in any other case—those estimates had to go through; there was no closure applied. What relation on earth, all this has to the subject we are discussing to-day—I am entirely at a loss to understand.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will not discuss the remarks of the leader of the Opposition in regard to public ownership at the present time. An occasion will come probably, before the House closes, to point out who really are the enemies of public ownership in endeavouring at every step to wreck the Canadian National Railways.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: The right hon. gentleman referred to "another place." I will not make any reference to it I will only say that I am surprised that the right hon. gentleman has such intimate knowledge of what is going to go on over there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not, at any stage, make a reference to what was going to go on, I referred only to what had gone on.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend referred to a certain bill being kicked out, and the vote had not been taken at the time he was talking.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it had. I was so informed; perhaps I was wrongly informed. I was informed it had been done on the motion of a Liberal Senator.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was a motion made in another chamber last night by the leader of my right hon. friend's party in the Senate for the six months' hoist for a certain bill, but unless the vote was taken a few moments after the House met this morning the matter was still undecided. However the facts as to that will develop in time. I wish to suggest to the committee that we get back to this item. I want to say this with respect to any circulars that were issued: I suppose there is not a party represented in this House but has at some time or other issued such circulars. I remember some beautiful illustrations on the bill boards in the last general election containing my right hon. friend's physiog., and an inscription stating that the country would be wrecked if he did not stay at the helm.

Mr. LAPOINTE: "Arthur will lead us through."

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. "Let Arthur do it". This is not a new work at Belle River. Up to this date $28,000 has been expended in keeping the harbour at Belle River open. Those who understand the situation will know that that vicinity is a flat country, almost on a level with lake St. Clair. Belle river runs in from the lake. Consequently in that entrance to the harbour up into the river there is constant silting, which has to be dredged practically every year. The proposition made now will be an economic one, to my mind, to put up a protection wall along the side of the channel and dredge it out, in the hope that this protection wall will do away with the necessity of an annual grant, which both sides of the House have been giving for years, to keep the channel open. As to coal and other commodities which are used and handled there, the desire is to make the channel deep enough to take a boat of a fifteen-foot draft. That is the whole story, and it is absolutely defensible. It will be an annual saving instead of being an annual grant to keep this channel clear.

I am not going to discuss the question of the election. I suppose even in Grenville there may have been some discussions. I have no doubt that it was said that when the Welland canal was finished they would have the elevators at Prescott. But I want to point out that one of the things impressed on me—and I urged strongly to have it go into the estimates—by my predecessor in office was this very item, and before he went South he handed me a memorandum of this item to have it put in the estimates, stating that it was absolutely necessary for Belle River. If there had been no election and our late lamented friend had not been called away—and nobody ever dreamed of the sad occurrence that necessitated the by-election—the item would have been in the estimates just the same. This item can be defended on the ground of utility and economy.

Mr. FORKE: I do not want to enter into any lengthy discussion in connection with this vote. Of course we are all anxious to know

the right thing to do under the circumstances. The right hon. leader of the Opposition referred to harangues that have been delivered in this House this forenoon. I quite agree with him, and perhaps they can be placed in the proper category by those who have been listening to them. Referring to the posters and bills that have been exhibited in the House, I am not very much interested in them. I understood something about the procedure that took place in elections under the old-time system of carrying on elections. I wish to make a statement, but I do not make it in any boasting spirit. Some happenings have been taking place in Ontario that seem to have created a different atmosphere in the House for the last day or two. I want to tell this House that the spirit that brought the Progressive party into existence is alive to-day, and I may say that party is not satisfied with this system of carrying on public debates on public questions; and if hon. members think for one moment that that same spirit I speak of is decaying or going back, they are very, very much mistaken. I am more convinced as the days pass that that spirit is growing in this country and the country is tired of this method of discussing public questions. We are discussing an item of public interest, and we have had to listen almost for hours to lengthy speeches as to how elections were carried on. I protest against this. I know that it may seem presumptuous for a new member in this House to deal with such matters, but I think we have reached such a serious stage in Canada that we are entitled to discuss questions on their merit, and I am satisfied that a good deal of the discussion that has taken place to-day has not been directed to the question, whether the vote is right or wrong. I do not want to throw blame on any party, but I would like to say to members of the House that they can go into the constituency of Brandon, or they may go into any constituency in Canada, and if they can find any circular of the description which has been discussed, supporting the Progressive candidate, I will take back what I am saying just now.

Mr. HANSON: My hon. friend's party adopts the "Holier than thou" attitude.

Mr. FORKE: We can deal with my hon. friend some other time. We are not at all afraid. It may seem presumptuous for some members who have not been in parliament very long to make a few remarks and compel some of those of superior wisdom to keep quiet during the time we have the floor. We are very much enlightened by the remarks which come from these quarters. I do not know if I understand just exactly whether this is a proper item or not. It has been said that dredging has been carried on year after year. Now, if the government has been incurring this expense for years, and if this vote will obviate that expenditure in the future, I think it should pass. I am anxious—and I know the members behind me are anxious—to do what is right in this matter. I will confess that the quotations made by the Prime Minister a few moments ago were something of an eye-opener to me, in regard to passing these large sums of money in the closing days of the session. But that does not make it right. I think it is bad practice and should be discontinued as far as possible. At the same time I think I will have to vote for the appropriation in this particular case.

Mr. BAXTER: I think, perhaps, the item sinks into relative insignificance compared with the principle, or the lack of it, which has just been enunciated by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). On many occasions in this House we have been treated to declarations by the hon. member, and by some of the members of his party that the two old parties, not venerable at all because of their age, were absolutely worn out, and that we must look to these members to give us a lead and direction, and—shall I say—an uplift, in matters of public life. Yet we are read another lecture this morning, and we are told that matters which have been discussed are matters of utter indifference to this would-be great party. If there is anything in the matter being discussed this morning it is the question of whether the expenditures made by this parliament should be dictated by necessity and by principle, or whether the moneys of this Dominion should be flagrantly and openly used for the debauching of a particular constituency. And the hon. member for Brandon is utterly indifferent to such a thing as that. He refers to the two old parties and says that he will take no part in what he terms the squabble between those parties. If that be his attitude and the attitude of his party, he need not be at all surprised that the public is treating that party just in the way that that party deserved to be treated, in proportion to its hypocrisy with regard to the needs of public life. If debauchment is a matter of indifference to this party, if they care not whether expenditures are right or wrong, if they see no principle or lack of principle, if they will not rise and condemn a violation of principle in public life, what shrift can they expect from the electors who sent them here

to represent the higher principle of driving these errors of the two old parties out of public life?

What my hon. friend wants to know is only this, not whether this wharf is to be used for bootlegging or for some suspicious boat or boats to be tied up to, but where it will be located and how much it will cost. It is a matter of utter indifference to him whether it is applied to a constituency or not. As he speaks in the name of his party, so may he expect his party to be judged by the electorate of Canada—and the handwriting is pretty plain upon the wall at the present day. You have been "weighed in the balances and found wanting." You have lickspittled to the government through the whole of one session and part of another, and you have traded upon the rights of the rest of Canada. You have got what you could; you have got your small pittance, and in the hour of your disappointment you say to the people of Canada: "These matters in connection with the two old parties are of no interest to me." It is not a new road in the West; it is not a question of grain rates; it is only a violation of public principles, only a lowering of the standard of national honour—and these things are all matters of indifference to the men of the great, boundless sweep of the prairies.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I said that I wanted to ask a question with regard to this item. We were told that there was a recommendation for some large sum of money. This item is for only $30,000. I should like to have it clearly stated what the estimate was on the recommendation made by the engineers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The original estimate by the engineer of the cost of work of construction was $72,500, the sheet pile wall being estimated at $60,000 sufficient to provide for an ultimate dredging of the channel to a depth of eighteen feet. But after further consideration it was decided that a wall to provide for the maintenance of a ten-foot channel would provide a channel for some time to come at a greatly reduced cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been waiting to see what answers would be made by the sober and sensible members of the government in connection with the charges made and admitted in regard to this by-election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Admitted in what way?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member (Mr. Healy) said that he knew of this

circular although he had not seen it. I do not know how he managed to dodge it. It must have been hard to dodge, but I take his word that he did dodge it.

Mr. HEALY: Might I be permitted to ask a question? I am afraid the hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I have known for some time that the leader ot fhe Opposition (Mr. Meighen) had in his possession a circular which he proposed to use at an opportune moment. I have never seen the circular. I had heard that circulars were issued, but this is the first time I have ever seen it or heard it read. Whether it was issued by a friend of mine or by an enemy, I do not know. But I do know that the leading Conservative of Belle River and the gentleman who is mentioned in the circular got into a personal row over a shipment of a cargo of beer into that locality. Probably the gentleman whose letter has been produced here to-day, but whose name has not been given to us, is the man. I am not prepared to say. There is a circular, the only one I have ever seen. Whether it was issued by a friend or an enemy, I do not know. It is in print and there is no signature to it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know what the hon. gentleman interrupted me for. His interruption was certainly not to ask a question. What I said was that he said he had not seen this circular, and I did not know how he could dodge seeing it. He says that he does not know whether it was printed by a friend or an enemy. Let me tell him that it is printed by his friend, Mr. James Cooper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And paid for.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How does the right hon. gentleman know that?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is printed. I do not propose to be drawn away from what is a real matter of public moment, and that is this: Does this government that wants to enforce the law, propose to be a party to this kind of illegal treatment and illegal practice? It is admittedly illegal. Or does the government intend to argue that this poster is legal? The government cannot do that; it knows that this is illegal. I will assume for the minute that it would be quite impossible to expect this government to enforce the law against its friends—let us assume that that will be too high a standard altogether to expect from this government, and that the law as against one of its friends will never be enforced. Let us go a step further. Is

this government of the view that public moneys ought to be voted by it for the purpose of implementing a corrupt election practice? That is the grave question to which we want an answer. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that he had never seen a greater scandal than what went on in former years when votes were being put through. I think the scandal consists rather in what is being done than in the amount of business that is being performed. I would ask my hon. friend if he could find in any of those votes consideration for value received, for goods delivered, for votes purchased? "King needs Tim'—So do you. Tim' and King. that's the thing." "Tim" is the first in this wonderful organization.

Mr. MARTELL: Quite a good organization.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are delivering the goods, I admit. "Tim" starts the thing, but "King" is the man who is now supplying the money which enables this thing to be done. Hon. gentlemen say something about other circulars. They know that has absolutely nothing to do with the question. They know there can be honest circulars; they know there can be dishonest circulars which affront every single principle of our election law. It is cheap, easy, to refer to circulars, placards, of my right hon. friend adorning fences and that sort of thing. There was absolutely nothing wrong in that. No bribe was offered in any of those. We were not trying to bribe the electorate, nor did we.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hon. gentlemen laugh. They think it is a matter for laughter that their party and their name can be associated with direct illegal promises, with direct bribes; and when anyone tries to say anything in connection with the matter, he is to be met with laughter, which is the only argument that can be advanced against a criminal proceeding.

Mr. PUTNAM: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does he honestly say that that is what we are laughing at?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know what my hon. friend could not or would not laugh at. He laughs when he thinks that will serve any party advantage. I do not know how many of them are real laughs and how many are forced laughs or laughs of another character.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What kind is my hon. friend's laugh?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This, of course, is the only sort of argument.

Mr. JACOBS: The laugh that "speaks the vacant mind."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then there must be an awful lot of rooms to let over there. The government is responsible for the proper conduct of public business; it is responsible for the enforcement of Dominion legislation. Have hon. gentlemen no sense of decency left at all? When the result of this purely, absolutely, admittedly, illegal thing is brought to their attention it is met by bursts of laughter displaying the "vacant minds" which the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) alludes to. Is that their idea of public decency? The Prime Minister talks about "scandal." Well, he is exhibiting the biggest kind of scandal; he is showing that the government are prepared to implement corrupt promises by votes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I want to say on behalf of the government that this is the first time their attention has been called to the fact that there was such a circular in use in the by-election. Both the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) know very well that the question of infractions of the election law is one that can be dealt with by the persons who engage in elections; and he and his friends, if there was any breach of the law, might very well have taken proceedings long ere this. My hon. friend is not fair: he entirely ignores the evidence, which is overwhelming, as to the representations to Mr. Kennedy of the municipality interested in regard to the expenditure of the money on this very work which was made by my right hon. friend's government in 1919, recognizing the necessity for keeping up an avenue of communication at Belle River. This proposition which we are submitting to parliament was originated long before the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Healy) came to the House. It was considered and reported upon by the engineers as a necessary public work which has been recognized by everyone in the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why does the hon. member not withdraw the vote now that he knows it is wrong?

At one o'clock the committee took recess

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The question is on the amendment. Moved by Mr. Meighen

that vote No. 508 be reduced by $30,000 by striking out the item, "Belle River—harbour improvements."

Amendment, (Mr. Meighen) negatived; Yeas, 5; Nays, 29.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—	
St. John Harbour—improvements—further amount required..	$ 8,000
Toronto — Harbour improvements — further amount required..	600,000
Port Arthur and Fort William—Harbour improvements—further amount required..	192,200
	$800.200

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the Ontario vote carried before the estimates had time to be opened?

The CHAIRMAN: No, they were opened.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why the question was not put before one o'clock, or at one o'clock, when hon. members were here. However, the lesson is obvious.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice there is a vote of $600,000 for Toronto harbour improvements. The government is under a contractual obligation in connection with works in that harbour. The order in council is old, I know, and it could not be all carried out at once, but the work is much overdue. Is my hon. friend going to start the bridge this year under this vote?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The following are the items which make up this $600,000:

(a) Reconstruction in concrete of a further 478 lineal feet of the east pier of the eastern entrance; (b) to pay R. Miller & Sons, Limited the drawback held in connection with their contract for the construction of the western breakwater, if item (c) is not proceeded with.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the amounts?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): They are: $67,000 for the first and $50,000 for the second. Then:

(c) Toward the completion of the western breakwater, involving the construction of 4,270 lineal feet of breakwater, including returns, in 9 sections, fronting on approximately 4,760 feet of shore line along the exhibition grounds; total estimated cost, $1,033,340; amount required for 1923-24, $471,000. Then, (d) office maintenance, salaries, etc., further amount required, if breakwater to be completed, $12,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would point out that all that has been done here is in large part the work necessary to maintain the harbour itself; nothing is being done to implement the undertaking with the city. The city has a very vital interest in the question of the bridges which were agreed to be constructed before the war. As the amount is cut down so much in connection with this programme, and as the city has spent over $20,000,000 on its part, when is the bridge to be built, and why is there no provision for it now?

[The Chairman.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am instructed that a deputation representing the Toronto city council, the Exhibition commissioners and the city generally conferred with the Department of Public Works, and what is proposed to be done under this vote is the carrying out of their ideas. I am advised that they prefer that that should be done now rather than that the work should proceed on the bridges.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure they did not abandon the question of the bridges.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Oh, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And I am sure that this does not represent anything like what they wanted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I can only say what I am advised by the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. GOULD: By way of preface to an observation I wish to make on this item, I may say that hon. members opposite are very anxious to have these items passed without proper discussion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GOULD: That is shown by the frequent and insistent shouts of "carried." It would be a signal lesson to hon. gentlemen if by chance their names could be recorded to show how earnest they are in the matter of attention to what should be, and what is considered by this side, as the country's business.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. GOULD: We have the right here, perhaps, to administer little political lectures as well as to receive them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If my hon. friend will permit me, I trust he will not misunderstand the attitude of the government. We are very anxious to have the fullest and freest discussion and to give all information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The taking of a vote at 2 o'clock, before hon. members were in, looks like it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I had nothing to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to say to the right hon. gentleman that the vote was taken considerably after 3 o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I meant 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: There was ample opportunity for all members to be present who desired to be here at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not very much after 3 o'clock now. I was detained for one minute by a man calling me at the door, and just as I came in the vote carried after discussion of only one item, although a great many other hon. members were anxious to discuss other items in that same vote.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask my right hon. friend who, in his estimation, is responsible for the passing of the item?—the committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would think so, yes. I think the committee knows who is responsible all right.

Mr. BELAND: What else could we do?

Mr. GOULD: I appreciate the statement of the minister in charge of the estimates, but I think that statement might well be directed to the hon. gentleman of whom I have complained; it might have cooled their ardour and their anxiety for the passing of these estimates as indicated by the continuous shouting of "carried, carried." I wish to make an inquiry with regard to the sandbars, to which reference has repeatedly been made in connection with these estimates. These sands have accumulated in the harbours and around the wharves; it seems to me they must be of some commercial value, and I rose to ask whether any commercial utilization was made of them as a sort of salvage by the government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am not an expert on that subject. With regard to the conditions that exist on the Atlantic coast I can say for my hon. friend's information that this sand is used in a great many cases in connection with building operations. Owing to the tremendous storms on the Atlantic the sand bars that are to be found around our harbours are continually moving from one part to another, and wharves and breakwaters are put up to regulate and control the movements of the current and the shifting of the sand so that the harbours can be kept open for navigation purposes. With regard to conditions on the St. Clair river near Detroit, the land there is very low-lying, almost on the level of the water, and there are also very large marshes. The sand shifts with the river current and breakwaters are necessary in order to maintain access to the harbour.

Mr. GOULD: Since the House rose at one o'clock I had the opportunity of having a conversation with a gentleman who resides in the vicinity of this flat land that is spoken of by the minister. I do not know the man's politics, I do not think he was speaking politically; but he told me, when I asked for information, that these lands were so flat that no matter what sort of breakwater was built—

Mr. CAHILL: What item is the hon. gentleman speaking to?

Mr. GOULD: I am speaking of Belle River.

Mr. CAHILL: That is passed.

Mr. GOULD: It has passed but the information might be useful to the committee. This man stated that in his opinion, no matter in what position a breakwater was put to block the sand it would not prevent the filling up of this harbour, because the land was so flat. The dredging of the harbour, he thought, would be another of these "hardy annuals" that I spoke of last night. If he is right, it does seem to me that the department or the government—not only this government but any government in power in this country—should always make an investigation first and determine whether it is possible in view of the current to prevent the movement of the silt and sand by means of a breakwater.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Any government or any responsible body that has to do with the expenditure of money must rely, not upon casual opinions given by gentlemen in the vicinity, but upon the opinions of their engineers who have been trained for this particular purpose. The recommendation to parliament in this case was made only after a study of the situation by the engineer of the department who has had long experience in this work. This is a technical matter, and we must rely upon the judgment of the engineer in each case.

Mr. GOULD: Again referring to sand bars, a large number of these items in the Supplementary Estimates are for dredging operations that must be carried on close to urban centres where sand is required for construction purposes, and it seems to me that the govern-

ment should have before them some evidence to show that they have salvaged a lot of this sand for use in that way.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is in the records of the department, and I am sure the deputy minister will be glad to let my hon. friend have the information.

Mr. GOULD: Is there nothing on the records before the minister?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In the western part of Ontario there is an arrangement between the Public Works department and the province of Ontario by which the sand is distributed among the various municipalities and to individuals at a set price agreed upon.

Mr. GOULD: That is good information.

Mr. ARTHURS: I should like to ask how it comes that the engineers are so unanimously in favour of improvements in the constituency of Muskoka? There are four votes here out of about thirty-five for that county, and it just happens that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Hammell) has recently changed his seat in this chamber.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not know anything about that, myself.

Mr. HAMMELL: If I have the permission of the Chair I can tell the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) the reason why there are two or three small items here for that constituency.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did you change?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why are you over there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member please tell us why he is sitting where he is?

Mr. HAMMELL: I am not sitting at present.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You won't be, very long.

Mr. HAMMELL: There is an item here of $2,700 for a breakwater in the town of Bracebridge. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Parry Sound has been at Bracebridge at some time during his career. Bracebridge is such an important centre, in fact, that the right hon. leader of the Opposition thought it worth his while to board a special train and deliver some of his eloquent speeches there during the campaign of 1921. The town wharf at Bracebridge is situated close to a large falls, and every spring during the freshet season sand is washed down from the foot of the falls to the wharf, making it necessary for considerable dredging to be done there every spring and summer. The engineers, some two or three years ago, reported that by the construction of a small breakwater the current could be diverted and this continual dredging be obviated. That is the reason why that item is there. Another item is for the village of Grassmere.

Mr. ARTHURS: What is the population?

Mr. HAMMELL: The population is quite considerable.

Mr. ARTHURS: How many?

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that this vote has been passed, and he is not in order in discussing it now.

Mr. HAMMELL: I am quite satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on resolution No. 491—St. John harbour improvements, Toronto harbour improvements, and Port Arthur and Fort William harbour improvements.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This seems rather an unusual procedure. We took the other resolutions item by item and passed them that way.

The CHAIRMAN: It was agreed by the committee that the Ontario vote should be taken in bulk. It was asked by the hon. gentleman leading the opposition that the Nova Scotia vote be taken item by item, and it is only with the consent of the committee that the votes have been taken that way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just to be accurate, Mr. Chairman, I did not ask that they should be taken item by item. The Chair did it, and perfectly properly. Then, later on, we thought we might save time by taking them in bulk, and we did so.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member leading the opposition was asked if we should take the first vote item by item. He gave his assent and the committee gave its assent also. That is the reason they were taken that way. We are now on resolution No. 491. Shall the resolution carry?

Resolution agreed to.

Public buildings—Nova Scotia, $146,650.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt that it is the pleasure of the government, and probably of the hon. member for Halifax, that this vote carry. I notice that three of the items composing it are for the city of Halifax.—Halifax immigration building, $95,900, Halifax quarantine station, $17,000, and Hali-

fax Rockhead hospital improvements, $25,000. Further on in the estimates very large sums will also be found for Halifax, and any who may have had any doubt as to the probability of a by-election in that riding this summer may now have their doubts set at rest.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The first of the three items is really an inter-departmental matter, it involves a payment to the Railway department who are the owners of pier No. 2 which is used in connection with the immigration business. The second item, repairs to the quarantine station—in this the Department of Public Works bears its share. The vote for the quarantine station is one which was made at the request of the Department of Health. They are remodelling the quarantine buildings throughout the Dominion so as to afford better facilities for the treatment of people who happen to be ill when they come to our shores. In the case of parties suffering from measles, or diseases of a like character which are not very dangerous, instead of requiring the ship to be sent to quarantine and holding the patients at some inaccessible point, necessitating also the holding up of people in sound health who are travelling at the same time, arrangements are being made now by the Department of Health not only at Halifax but at Quebec and other points where quarantine stations exist, whereby persons afflicted with disease of the character mentioned are brought ashore quickly for detention and treatment without detaining the other passengers. The request for this vote has come entirely from the Department of Health and from no other quarter.

Item agreed to.

Mr. HANSON: In regard to the vote of $5,000 for a public building site at Edmundston, I desire to offer my congratulations to the department for making this provision. Has the site been selected yet and if so what price has been paid and on what street is it located?

The CHAIRMAN: I have just declared resolution No. 492 carried. The hon. member would be more in order in speaking on resolution 493 which includes the item to which he refers,

Public buildings—New Brunswick—	
Edmundston—public building site	$ 5,000
St. John quarantine station—new buildings, repairs, etc..	15,000
Sackville—public building..	15,000
Sussex—public building—improvement—revote	4,500
Tracadie lazaretto—installation of electric light system—improvements, etc..	6,500
	$46,000

Mr. HANSON: I simply wish to know whether the site at Edmundston has been purchased. If so, what is the purchase price and where is it situated?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) My information is that on account of the construction of the new international bridge at Edmundston there is necessity for this public building. No site has yet been purchased. I understand that it is desirable that the site, if possible, should be near the bridge.

Mr. HANSON: There has never been a decent post office at Edmundston since it has been a town. I had great pleasure in calling the attention of the minister last year to the necessity for this building. I am glad now to see that my efforts are bringing forth fruit.

Mr. BROWN: I suppose it has not been suggested that this vote is prompted by any political motive on the part of the minister?

Mr. HANSON: You could not elect a Tory there no matter what you did.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In this resolution, No. 493, there is an item of $15,000 for a public building at Sackville. May I ask the minister what practice the government follows in connection with these new public buildings? Is the contract let by tender, or in what way is the work carried out?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): All this work is done by contract after calling for tenders. Nothing is being done by day work.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This is a new building?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Sackville is a university town of very considerable importance, and a very large community would be served by this building. If the members of the House could see the structure that has served as a post office in Sackville since 1894, when I first knew that community, they would realize that this vote should have been made years ago. I should like to know if this is the total vote for the purpose? I do not think it is adequate.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is intended merely for the purpose of obtaining a site and preparing plans so as to provide for building next year.

Mr. GARDINER: What is this public building used for?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): For a customs house and post office.

Mr. GOOD: Are we considering these votes item by item or in bulk form?

The CHAIRMAN: We are considering the bulk vote. If the committee desire to consider these resolutions item by item, and so intimate, we will do so. We are now considering resolution 493.

Mr. GOOD: I suggest it would take up very little more time if we considered the resolution item by item.

Mr. BUREAU: The committee have already passed upon that.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member moves a resolution to that effect and it carries that procedure will be adopted during the consideration of these estimates.

Mr. GOOD: I protest against considering these resolutions in bulk form.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): A great many of these items are of a purely routine character and it would be a waste of time for the committee to discuss them. If my hon. friend, or any other member, wants information on any particular item as we go along I shall be very glad to give it.

Mr. GOOD: It will take very little more time to read over each item and if we have no particular objection they can be carried. I think that would be a very much better procedure: it would give an opportunity to any hon. member to say anything he wished with respect to any matter that arises.

The CHAIRMAN: The opportunity is given to every member of the committee to discuss any item he wishes. The items are all read out. Now as to resolution 493, what is the pleasure of the committee?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: One question more. In regard to the item of $15,000 for the quarantine station at St. John, what is the purpose of this station? Is it to segregate and quarantine immoral politicians, or what is the purpose?

Mr. GRAHAM: At St. John? The idea!

Mr. SPEAKMAN: If it is, I will vote for it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Department of Health recommends this vote.

Mr. BELAND: I do not want at all to delay the proceedings, but my hon. friend (Mr. Speakman) is generally so fair that I think his question should be answered. St. John quarantine station is the second most important station in Canada. It is a winter station for use when the station at Quebec is closed. We receive through St. John a very large number of immigrants.

Resolution agreed to.

Public buildings—Prince Edward Island—Charlottetown—old bank building—repairs to roof, $4,000. Souris building—installation of electric wires, $1,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Purely repairs.

Resolution agreed to.

Maritime provinces generally—Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs etc.—further amount required, $5,200.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to ask the minister to explain this vote.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is required for the following improvements and repairs: Halifax customs house, repointing the exterior walls; North Sydney naval station, repairs to roofs. The latter was established during the war and the roofs are found to be in such a bad condition as to result in complete decay unless repairs are made. The other item has been reported on in the regular way by the inspectors of public buildings.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister, I think, was talking of resolution 494. I was addressing myself to resolution 495.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is what I was speaking of.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are there two public buildings to be dealt with?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend will see that the vote applied to Dominion public buildings in the Maritime provinces. I gave the two purposes for which the vote was required; $4,000 in Halifax for repointing the exterior walls of the custom house; and $1,200 for repairs to the roof of the North Sydney naval station.

Resolution agreed to.

Public buildings—Quebec—repairs and improvements, $180,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that we consider this resolution item by item, or deal with it generally?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If any hon. member desires information with respect to any particular item I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. ARTHURS: I should like to ask the minister what the policy of the department is in regard to new public buildings. I see this item in the resolution:

Terrebonne—new public building—re-vote $15,500. $22,000.

When we have asked for public buildings in various districts in Canada, we have been met with the objection that the country was poor and could not afford it. The people wanted some buildings in my riding, and I think other districts were in the same position, but they were put aside owing to the war. Large sums have been voted, but the construction was delayed owing to the war. If the policy of the government is to start a new programme now, and commence to erect public buildings in very unimportant places, I think the House should know it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Unless the necessities of the district require the building, it is not the policy of the government, except in exceptional cases, to indulge in the erection of any new buildings. But hon. members will recall the terrible fire that took place at Terrebonne last winter; they will remember that the town and all the facilities for carrying on the public affairs, post office and customs, were destroyed, and at present they have no building. In such a case the government feel it is only right the building should be replaced in order to enable the community to do business.

Mr. BUREAU: The whole town was swept out of existence.

Resolution agreed to.

Public buildings—Ontario, $316,400.

Mr. HANSON: One item here is "Haileybury—Armoury and post office $35,000." Surely this government is not building a new armoury?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The town of Haileybury suffered from a disastrous fire. The building was insured, and we are simply taking insurance money to replace the buildings. There are no other new buildings.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was insured by the municipality.

Mr. GOOD: Does the committee decide by the majority vote to take the estimates item by item, or otherwise?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. GOOD: Then I move that these estimates be taken item by item.

Mr. BUREAU: That point was decided yesterday. The hon. member was not in the House yesterday, but that was not the fault of the committee. I do not see that we should reverse our decision simply because the hon. member did not see fit to attend the sessions of the committee yesterday. However, I am willing to stay here till September.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know that the decision yesterday would bind the committee during all its sessions. It was simply decided to adopt that course yesterday.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have no objection to the motion.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member stayed away yesterday, but returns to-day and objects to these items being taken in the manner we decided yesterday.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Chairman will read each item, and if the hon. member wants any information in regard to an item as we go along, I will be delighted to give it to him. If any new expenditures are being inaugurated, it is only right and proper that they should be discussed. In the case of simple repairs, which have all been reported upon by the permanent engineers of the department, it seems to me that no good purpose will be served by going over them all. I hope the hon. member will adopt my suggestion.

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming): With regard to the armouries and post office at Haileybury, I may inform the committee that practically about all that is asked for in this $35,000 vote is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1,000. If you consider interest on $33,000 since the 10th of last October up to the present time, it will bring the amount close to $34,000, or about that sum. The armouries in Haileybury have been rented. It seems that the Public Works department or the Militia department do not rent their buildings, but they give them on the understanding that they shall be insured. The people of Haileybury were insuring these buildings any time they got the use of them for tombolas, dances or other entertainments, and they found it was expensive to insure them by the day—or night—or by the week. The board of trade and city council got together and decided to take out a yearly insurance. They placed $33,000 on the armouries, and about two months after the insurance had been effected the armouries were burned. Immediately afterwards, about the 10th October, the money was turned into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and all they are asking here is practically $1,000, in conjunction with their own money and interest to build a post office and put a roof on the armouries; so that they will be available for use.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that is quite a fair statement of the situation. I do not pretend to know the conditions at Haileybury, or whether the armouries are needed or not. I never had very much sympathy with this talk about nothing being needed in military expenditure because of the League of Nations and because the last war was fought. That never appealed to me. It appealed more to hon. members of the government.

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming): Would the hon. member be in favour of voting $1,000 to the people who have been burned out and lost everything they owned there, so as to provide them with a post office, leaving out the question of the armouries?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not saying whether the vote is right or wrong. I do not think the statement of the hon. member was an exact statement of the facts.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fact that the armoury has been burned does not make the insurance money the property of the people of the district. It is the property of the people of Canada. It may be the insurance premium was paid as and by way of rental for the building, for the privilege of using it, because the danger of fire is greater in that case. That is the usual practice. That does not establish any claim on the insurance money. What we are deciding is whether we should erect the building. I am not objecting to that, but I do not want the hon. member's statement that it is the money of the district to go unchallenged.

Mr. GRAHAM: If it had not been insured the government would not have got anything, and we should have been asked to vote this money just the same; but in the Militia department they endeavour to exact the protection of the public building by asking those who use it to insure. In this case the armoury was being used continually by the people of Haileybury. They carried the insurance and it did not cost the government anything. In the vote of this amount of money, we just place our building, with the insurance money, where it was before, and put up an armoury more suitable to Haileybury. It must be remembered that Haileybury was wiped out. I received a cheque for the insurance myself and handed it in to the Receiver General.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think any one is disputing the receipt of the cheque. My hon. friend is buying some new building in Ottawa. Where is it? We start with $26,000. The item is:

Ottawa—towards purchase of building for government work shops, $26,000.

The CHAIRMAN: While the hon. minister is looking up that information, does the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) desire to have his motion put to the committee, that we should deal with these estimates item by item while they are being passed?

Mr. GOOD: I was interrupted. I was going to speak again on that matter. I am sorry I was not present yesterday, but I do not understand that the vote was that all the contents of these pages should be voted in a lump sum. I thought it referred only to certain specified blocks of items. If I was misinformed, and if this committee and all the component parts of it agreed to a general principle of putting through the items, I shall have to abide by that decision. But it seems to me a very foolish kind of decision, if I may say so.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that each numbered item is a vote made up of certain parts, any one of which, or the whole item, can be debated, and amendments introduced.

Mr. GOOD: If we had had time to go through these lists carefully and to mark those items that we wished to take up, the situation would be different. As it is, we are considering this very largely for the first time; and at the rate at which you read, it is pretty hard to form any adequate understanding of what is in one of these blocks of, maybe, twenty-five items. Very little longer time will be consumed if we take each item by itself, and if there is no objection, let it go through. If, however, the committee has come to a decision, I shall have to abide by the consequences.

Mr. CARROLL: While we are considering this as a bulk vote, that does not prevent any hon. gentleman from discussing any item in the vote to his entire satisfaction.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Good) claims that he has not had time to read the item. I would suggest that in order to make progress, we might suspend proceedings for about ten minutes, in order to give him an opportunity to read it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The workshops in connection with the Public Works department in Ottawa have been reported on by the foreman of heating and plumbing, the assistant mechanical engineer and the

junior mechanical engineer, as being absolutely unsanitary, and having conditions which have resulted in illness to the employees who work therein. Recommendations have been made to the department that they should obtain a building known as the Wine Vault building on George street, for government workshops in place of the Harris and Campbell building at the corner of Queen and O'Connor streets.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is meant by "government workshops?" What kind of work is carried on?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Carpenters, plumbers, masons—all men of that character who are employed, I understand, permanently in connection with carrying on all the repairs of this building and every other public building in Ottawa belonging to the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is the owner of the building?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Labelle & Brulé.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the assessed value of the property?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not think we have that here. Negotiations have not been closed.

Mr. ARTHURS: Has the government not a large number of buildings on Wellington street which are at present unoccupied?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am going to take that matter up in a moment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why are we voting this money to purchase another building when we already have buildings unoccupied?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend will remember that a plan of a most comprehensive character was prepared a number of years ago. If he looks at item No. 490, he will see that it reads:

Ottawa—new departmental buildings—compensation to architects for designs submitted, $30,000.

Hon. gentlemen are, perhaps, aware that a large tract of property running from the Supreme Court in a northwesterly direction along Wellington street was expropriated a number of years ago by the government. It was planned that there should be erected, in place of those old buildings which are very dilapidated, a series of permanent buildings where all the departments might be housed, instead of having them as they are to-day, in rented buildings scattered throughout Ottawa.

In 1912, the then government asked for competition among architects for the submission of plans and designs for buildings that would cover that particular part of the city, so as to carry out the idea of the then government. Owing to the war and the financial conditions that followed, all proceedings in connection with those plans were abandoned. Until the country is in a position to carry on a comprehensive plan for dealing with the situation, it is the policy of the government not to spend any money in connection with it. I am instructed by the departmental officers that reports are on file in the department, having regard to the health of the men employed in the present workshops, as to the impossibility of their carrying on under present conditions. This building is situated in the immediate vicinity of and convenient to the Hunter building where the present offices are. The whole matter has been reported upon and recommended by the officials.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister himself shows that nothing is being done with the large plan. There are some very good buildings on the site. I do not think that the Minister of Finance is of opinion that we ought to embark on that large and expensive plan for many years. Why could we not use some of our own property and stop buying property that we do not require?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The deputy minister advises me that all buildings there suitable for present governmental purposes are occupied and used by other departments.

Mr. CALDWELL: Will this amount be sufficient to buy the building?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this only a starter? I really think the government should consider the withdrawal of this item for the purpose of buying a new building at this time, especially in view of the fact that the other Chamber is likely to give our bill in connection with railway extensions the six months' hoist on the ground that we have not the money to build branch lines to feed our present system of railways. It looks as if we were casting about in the archives of the old departments for plans or suggestions that we might spend more money. At this time we should consider very seriously any new expenditures. There should be a great objection to bringing down Supplementary Estimates of this size at this late date of the session, but I am not going to discuss that feature of the question now. I have no objection even at this late date to Supplementary Estimates being

brought down for necessary repairs for carrying on the necessary work of the country, but an item for the purchase of a new building should not be put in the Supplementary Estimates, and I would urge strongly on the minister that he consider the advisability of withdrawing this appropriation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is proposed to sell the present building which, according to the sanitary authorities, the medical authorities and the engineers, is not suitable, owing to the conditions under which the men have to work. It is proposed to negotiate for the purpose of the other building, using this particular vote for the purpose. That, I am instructed by the department, is the only reason why this should be done.

Mr. CALDWELL: Where is the building that is probably to be sold, and what price could the government get for it? Have we any idea what the new building will cost?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The building at present used is situated at the corner of Queen and O'Connor streets. It is the policy of the department that they should utilize the sale of this other building as a site for building purposes in connection with stores for the purpose of obtaining the new building. Under the exchange which, it is expected, will be made, this appropriation will cover the whole of the cost of making the change, with the result that the men who work in Ottawa permanently will work under better conditions.

Mr. CALDWELL: Could the present building not be remodelled and made so that it would answer the purpose just as well? I do not wish to delay the discussion on this item, but I feel very strongly that this should be cut out. In order to facilitate business, I move that this item be reduced by the sum of $26,000, so as to cut out the item in connection with purchasing a building for government workshops.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a queer way of not delaying the proceedings.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): On this matter the government has no policy except the desire to do what is absolutely necessary. I think that the committee will pretty generally agree that the government cannot allow to continue a state of affairs in which carpenters, plumbers, masons and other workmen who are permanently employed by the department must carry on their work in unsanitary conditions that inevitably lead to bad health and sickness.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Mr. CALDWELL: How much of the plumbing, or of the masonry, on this house is done in buildings in some other part of the city? It seems to me that men who are engaged on a particular building should not have to spend very much of their time in some other part of the city.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am neither a carpenter nor a mason, nor do I believe my hon. friend is. I know enough about these occupations, however, to be convinced that these men must have some shops or some place where they can prepare their material before working on the particular building on which they are engaged. I am instructed by the officials that the conditions under which these men work are not satisfactory. As a matter of fact they are unsanitary, and it is imperative that they be improved. My hon. friend must realize that a carpenter uses a variety of tools and a great quantity of accessories which it is impossible for him to carry around with him. He simply must have a shop; at least, every carpenter and every plumber that I have ever known have found it necessary to have some place in which to store their tools, and all the appurtenances of their trades. Of course, if the workman is an itinerant gentleman and is content to walk around with his hat on his head then the conditions to which my hon. friend refers might exist.

Mr. CALDWELL: I quite realize that a plumber needs a shop; but the minister's idea of a carpenter's work seems to me to be somewhat like a story I once heard of a tramp. He asked a farmer for dinner and was told to go and hoe some beans. The tramp wanted the dinner first and he got it, and when the farmer asked him, "What about the beans?" he replied, "Bring along your beans if you want them hoed." Evidently there are a lot of carpenters engaged on this work who want the work taken to them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Let me read from the report:

> Ever since the Hunter building was built our men have had to work with electric light all day long. Think of mechanics having to work their whole day in a place like this. Lots of coal mines have better conditions than our shop, and as far as convenience is concerned, I can take a hand lawnmower in, but anything larger than that has to be taken apart as there is no door other than down a flight of stairs. The Ottawa Car Company of this city used to have their shop underground but the health authorities, through complaints of the factory inspector, compelled them to put their shop on the ground level. But they seem to have no jurisdiction over a government shop, therefore our employees have to suffer with conditions that lots of commercial firms would not tolerate.

If my hon. friend wants this condition to continue then he can press his motion.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are these shops underground?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Apparently they are.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think anybody wants an unsatisfactory condition of affairs to continue. That is not the point. But here is a government that owns any amount of property in the city, a great deal of it idle.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is not correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, a great deal of it, as anyone can see for himself.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am instructed by the deputy that that is not correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let anyone look for himself and see the vacant land owned by the government which is not being put to use.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend's government tried architects from all over the world and arranged for people to supervise the plans of this building. Does he mean to say that all that was done must be rendered futile?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend told us before that the government had to stop on account of financial conditions, and he knows perfectly well it will be many years before the plans can ever be gone on with. He knows also that we have any amount of property which we are renting at nominal rates because we cannot get any use for it; and this is the case both east and west. We have large tracts which are bringing in nominal rents of a dollar a year and the like. And yet the government at a time like this, undertakes new investments. The thing is ridiculous.

Mr. MARTELL: I think my hon. friend would be the first to oppose any suggestion on the part of the Department of Public Works that we should vote $10,000,000 to put up new buildings. It should be done, but he would oppose it because this government is in power.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I appeal simply to the sense of fairness of the committee. I happen to be one of the members representing the city of Ottawa and as such I think I might offer an explanation. If any hon. member who has spoken against the purchase of this property will go and examine for half an hour the building that now stands at the corner of Queen and O'Connor streets, and after that declare that the men working there are working under conditions that would be put up with in any civilized country, then he is not fit to be a member of this House. In that building at present there are about two or three hundred employees. It has been stated that some carpentering goes on there, and that is true. All the furniture that is repaired for the various departments is sent there, and the upholstering is done there. The masons and the plumbers have their quarters in the building, but their work constitutes only a small portion of the activi-

4 p.m. ties that are carried on in the place. The men employed in the forge and those who are welding pipes are working underground in the areas under the sidewalks along Queen and O'Connor streets. These men are using drills and machinery weighing two or three tons, some very much heavier than that; besides presses of all kinds. Molten metal is also taken out of some of the machines and formed into the equipment that is required in connection with the various departments. These men have to work in artificial light, and the only ventilation they have comes through the small windows situated immediately between the sidewalk and the ceiling. This condition has not been condemned by the provincial authorities because they have no power in the matter. In over ninety per cent of the offices there is no light because they are hemmed in by the adjoining buildings. There is a system of ventilation, it is true, but in all the offices the employees work in artificial light from morning till night the year round. It is true that the government owns large tracts of land along Victoria street and along Sussex street, and hon. gentlemen ask, why not establish the workshops in some of these buildings? Have they considered the practicability of installing the forges in these buildings in Victora street that are in a ramshackle, tumble-down state? Why two or three turns of the flywheel and the buildings would fall. Right along Sussex street, where this proposed purchase is to be made, there is the old Geological Museum now used for some purposes similar to those of the workshops in question. Next to that there is the large tract of land now used by the Department of Public Works for the storage of their cranes, trucks, sand, stone, piping and the like. This building is the only one that the architects have found suitable for the pur-

pose, because of its reinforced concrete walls, ceilings and foundations, which will permit of the installation of the plant and will provide workable conditions for the employees. It was proposed in 1920 that this item should form part of the estimates. In 1921, it was recommended that the item go in, but for reasons of economy, probably, it was not included. I have always stood for economy, but I refuse to stand for economy when it is to the detriment of the working people. The government has had this building for eight years at a rental of $8,000 a year, so that the building will in due time pay for itself. There is no doubt that, if not within the next few years, at least some time in the future, the proposed development in the matter of departmental buildings for Ottawa will take place, and in that event this building is just where it will serve the best purpose. I appeal to the spirit of fair play of the committee on behalf of the workingmen now engaged in the public service of Canada.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Does the government own the building on the corner of Queen and O'Connor streets?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): What is to be done with that building?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have explained that it is the intention to sell it.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I am sure that hon. members have no desire to keep our masons, plumbers and other workingmen in unsanitary surroundings, and the proposal of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) that this item be reduced should not be coupled with any suggestion of that kind. Why, there are offices in the Parliament buildings where the members cannot carry on their work without the continuous use of artificial light, and where there is no ventilation except what is afforded through a window or door. So that the conditions are similar in some parts of this building to what has been described by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevier). The government owns a considerable quantity of land in the city upon which they intend ultimately to erect departmental offices, and I rather think the present is a poor time to embark upon the purchase of more property. If this building is unsanitary, why not fix it up; why not make it sanitary? That would be much better than starting out on the purchase of new property. This item is for $26,000, but the minister tells us that will not complete the purchase.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I said it would, when the proceeds for the sale of the present building are added.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Will that complete the entire plan which is proposed?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is what I am instructed.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: How many buildings in Ottawa are used by the government?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon friend has asked me a big question. I think he had better wait till the Minister of Public Works himself is here.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: When we are voting this item, it is important to know what buildings are used by the government.

Mr. CALDWELL: This is not an item that should be in the Supplementary Estimates. The condition is not one that arose within the last month or two months; it seems it has been a permanent condition. I still think we should cut this item out and if necessary put it in the Main Estimates next year. We will have a chance then of considering it.

Mr. McGIVERIN: My hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Chevrier) has stated the present condition of the shops: it is simply disgraceful. The present building was purchased sixteen or seventeen years ago at a price of, I think, $42,000; to-day it is worth two or two-and-a-half times that amount. The point is that it is not now suitable for the purposes for which it is used.

Mr. CALDWELL: How long has it been used for its present purpose?

Mr. McGIVERIN: Ever since it was purchased—I think about seventeen years if my memory is correct.

Mr. CALDWELL: How long is it since the government found it was not sanitary?

Mr. McGIVERIN: It has been complained of for the last four or five years. The question has been raised whether any of these other buildings which were purchased in 1912 could be used for this purpose. The answer to that is that they are practically all old buildings which were taken over in connection with the plan for the erection of the new departmental offices. It seems to me that this is a very good exchange. The old building is in the central part of the city, and is very valuable. It could either be changed in some respects so that the upper parts could be used as offices, or it could be sold, and if it is sold I am convinced that the government can make a very good deal in connection with

it. We do hope in time to have proper departmental buildings in Ottawa so that the payment of heavy rentals may be avoided. That may not be a very popular thing for me to say, but it is the sane, businesslike way to deal with the matter. I speak subject to correction on the advice of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, but I am sure that the government has no building suitable for this purpose. I think, therefore, that we should carry the item, not only because to do so will be in the interests of the workingmen, but because it is a sound business proposition.

Mr. ARTHURS: Has the government an option on this property?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes—$116,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: What will be the cost of repairs, installation of machinery and so on?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The estimate is $25,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has the government any assurance as to what it will get for the old building?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Valuations have been made upon it.

Mr. CALDWELL: But no offer?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The whole thing is to go through subject to that.

Amendment (Mr. Caldwell) negatived; Yeas, 38; Nays, 74.

Mr. GOOD: I should like a little information on two of these items, the Toronto casualty clearing station and the Toronto building for the Seed branch.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In regard to the casualty clearing station item, which is in full and final settlement of all claims of the Canadian National Railways for property expropriated, this is really nothing more than a book-keeping entry; it is required to pay the Canadian National Railways in full and final settlement of all claims whether for compensation or otherwise in respect to the expropriation and possession of land lying west of McLennan Avenue. These lands originally belonged to the railway and they were taken over by this department during the war for the purpose of building a casualty clearing station. There is no further use for it, and this is simply a book-keeping entry to clear up the matter.

In regard to the building for the Seed branch this is simply a preliminary vote which has been placed in the estimates at the request of the Department of Agriculture, who desires to obtain a building in Toronto in connection with their seed work.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have had difficulty for a good many years now in securing proper accommodation for our seed laboratories. It is very essential to have a northern light for seed inspection and examination, and this vote is for the purpose of securing a site for such a building so that we shall not be dependent forever on rented quarters that invariably are not suited for the purpose.

Mr. BROWN: Why is this money being spent in Toronto?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That has been the headquarters of the seed laboratory work for many years. It serves all of western Ontario and is the centre of a large portion of the clover and grass seed work which are two of the most important items in connection with our laboratory work.

Mr. HALBERT: I notice that $113,000 is being spent in Toronto. Is the minister sure that none of this is to debauch the Tory electors of Toronto?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend lives closer to Toronto than I do, but it seems to me it is pretty difficult to lead those Toronto Tories back to the true faith.

Mr. CHURCH: What about a custom house for Toronto?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have a number of experimental farms and is there any reason why this laboratory could not be located on one of them?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is only one experimental farm on which it could be located, and that is the Central farm at Ottawa. That is not the centre of the work. You would have to bring the whole of the work of western Ontario to Ottawa. Besides, the headquarters have been in Toronto since the inception of this laboratory work, right in the centre of the field where the work is required. The work has grown into great importance especially for export purposes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the great urgency for going on with this work this year? Cannot we wait a year or two longer? We have been doing very well, you know.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The urgency is that we have been constantly changing our quarters in the past on account of having to rent, and we have had great difficulty in getting

quarters with the proper light. We think the time has come in the importance of this industry when we should have quarters of our own. Why not wait?—the hon. member says. Because we have frequently to change our quarters, and we have great difficulty in securing the proper light, and good light is the first essential in this work.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the minister can give no better reason for going on with the work this year—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the hon. gentleman does not know enough about the work to know if it is a good reason or not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That may be the honourable and parliamentary retort of the minister. He usually retorts that way when he gets into difficulties. But may I suggest that he has not, in my opinion given a sufficient reason? And if there is no better reason I do not think the vote is justified this year. It may be that the time will come when it will be justified, but not under existing financial conditions. In two short years of parliamentary experience I have come to the conclusion that this government, which came into power on an economy platform, has been spending money like a drunken sailor. I think this item may well stand over.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Clark, the Seed Commissioner, tells me that in some of our laboratories we are not getting over sixty per cent efficiency, due to the bad light. If you can scarcely see to do your work you have to take just so much longer time. Mr. Clark has made a close analysis of the work performed by the staff under different lighting conditions and has found that between good and bad lighting conditions there is just the difference of between one hundred per cent and sixty per cent, and in addition you do not get proper results with a poor light. Why should we give excuses for this work? These are absolute reasons I am giving. Why should we object to spending money in Toronto on work that is required? This accommodation has been required for some years, and the need is becoming more urgent all the time because of the increased importance of the work.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not ask for any excuse when I asked my question. I asked for a reason and I have not yet obtained it. Why could not the laboratory be located at the Experimental farm? There is good light there, and the only reply I got was that the laboratory has always been in Toronto. That is no reason. If Ottawa is sufficiently central to carry on experimental work of all kinds I cannot see why it would not be suitable for this work rather than spending money here, there and everywhere all over the country for buildings. I asked if there was any underlying reason why this work could not be done in connection with an experimental farm, and the minister has not yet given me an answer.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend speaks of this as experimental work.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not use the expression that this was experimental work. I asked why it could not be carried on in connection with an experimental farm.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, implying that it was experimental work. My hon. friend is familiar with the quarters in Winnipeg where the grain inspection is performed, and knows that the very first essential in this work is light. It is the same with this seed inspection work, only even more essential because the grass seeds are much smaller than the cereal seeds. Ottawa is not sufficiently central. Toronto is a more central city. Therefore if we are to give the proper service such as we want to do the building must be suitably located for the work necessary to be performed.

Mr. GOOD: Will the minister tell us what this vote is for? Is it to buy land and construct a building suitable for the purpose?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know the details of the vote; that information can be given by the Public Works department. I presume it is for the purpose of making a start. The first investment usually is to secure a site.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to have information on this point. I know something in regard to the subject.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): As far as the department of Public Works is concerned the position of affairs is this. The amount is required towards the purchase of a site on which to erect a building for the Seed branch of the Department of Agriculture. No plans or specifications have yet been decided upon. The matter was initiated for the first time by the Department of Agriculture a few weeks ago. Dr. Grisdale the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, writes as follows:

> The department has been looking into the possibility of acquiring certain land and erecting a new building for our Seed branch in the city of Toronto. A site has been located for this purpose at 84 Collier Street, about two blocks north of Bloor street and about 200 yards east of Yonge street. This property contains a frontage of 84 feet and a depth on the level

of the street of about 120 feet where the lot drops into a ravine 60 or 70 feet below the level of Collier street. The total depth of the lot is said to be 164 feet.

Nothing has yet been done beyond this request to the Department of Public Works to provide a vote for enabling a commencement to be made.

Mr. SHAW: What is the proposed cost of this site? Surely we can have some general estimate of that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): As a department we have no information on the subject.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is not the site for this building very far up? What is the reason for the selection of such a site?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Dr. Grisdale, Deputy Minister of Agriculture simply suggests the site on Collier street as a possible one. Nothing has been done by this department in the matter of making a purchase. The whole matter will be reviewed by the officials of the Public Works department before anything is done in regard to it.

Mr. BROWN: Is this building intended to serve for the province of Ontario, and therefore Toronto chosen, or is it intended to serve the whole Dominion?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Dominion is divided into, I think, six areas for seed purposes. This is the one for the province of Ontario. There is one at Calgary, another at Winnipeg, and still another in the Maritime provinces—five or six in all. There is a centre selected for each area and Toronto happens to be the centre for this particular one. If any better centre could be secured I suppose there would be no objection to taking it. Toronto is the centre for Ontario just as Winnipeg is the centre for Manitoba, and Calgary the centre for the western part of the prairies.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not think the minister can be accused of partisanship in this matter. If he desired to germinate political seeds in favour of the government he would hardly go to Toronto.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think hon. members may be well assured of one thing: Any single advantage that this government gives to Toronto is given because it cannot be helped.

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me, from the letter which was read from Dr. Grisdale and from the other information which we have had, that this is a new idea, in fact the statement was made that it originated only a few weeks ago. It occurs to me that the vote should stand over for further investigation. I happen to know something about the University buildings at Toronto and the buildings of the Agricultural college at Guelph, and I should like to see whether some arrangement could not be made to utilize the buildings of these two institutions, which are empty for a great part of the year and where the most excellent facilities may be enjoyed. I am not in a position to say that it would be convenient to do so, but it seems to me we should go rather cautiously in a proposition of this kind. I would strongly recommend that the matter be held over for further investigation. I do not think we have sufficient evidence at the present time to justify this expenditure.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I desire to say on behalf of the Department of Public Works that the department will not regard itself bound to any particular site. It will go into the whole question with the greatest possible care in order to have the site for this building located in the proper place with the least expense and with a view to promoting the best interests of the country. Nothing whatever has been done to commit the department in any way, and the whole matter will be carefully considered before any expenditure is made.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Is this vote for the site only?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is only for the site.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): What further expenditure is anticipated? Where is it going to end?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Nothing further can be done without parliament voting the money. But you cannot start to build without securing a site. My hon. friend will see I am sure, that fault would be found if we proposed to parliament a large expenditure without making all necessary inquiries and having complete information. We are proceeding cautiously. Nothing has been settled about a site; we have simply had a recommendation from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. Nothing further can be done without coming to parliament for authority and I say, on behalf of the department that nothing will be done without the greatest possible care and thorough examination of the location.

Mr. HOCKEN: Who are the present owners of this property on Collier street?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have no information on that point. The only information the department has is contained in the letter from Dr. Grisdale.

Mr. HOCKEN: He selected the site apparently?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, he suggests a site on Collier street. He does not say anything in his letter as to whom it belongs to.

Mr. CHURCH: I see an item here for Postal Station "A", Toronto. The receipts for the past fiscal year from the post office at Toronto amount to nearly $6,000,000 and the accommodation is not what it should be. It is deplorable to have a building of that character in the city of Toronto. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) asked the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) the other day what the government intended to do in the way of improvements, and was told that he would find that out from the Minister of Public Works, (Mr. King, Kootenay) when the Supplementnary Estimates came down. The receipts from the post office, customs, and other sources bring the total revenue which Toronto yields to the government up to $90,000,000. Cannot the minister give us better facilities than we now have there in the customs building? The building is a very dilapidated one and the business men are complaining very much. I should like to find out what is going to be done to improve matters in the next twelve months. The custom house is a public utility, but business men cannot satisfactorily transact business there with the existing facilities. Surely when Toronto is giving the treasury a revenue of $90,000,000 the government should do something better than they are doing in the matter of providing improvements. Business men say that the existing facilities at the custom house are a positive detriment to trade. I should like the minister to look into this matter during the recess, and see whether something cannot be done to meet the wishes of the industrial community, to say nothing of the general public. I warn the government that if better facilities are not provided the treasury will suffer a great loss of revenue.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am instructed by the deputy in regard to this vote of $30,000 to complete postal station "A" in Toronto, that it is the end of an expenditure of over $1,000,000 for that particular purpose. I am also instructed that the postal station in Toronto, when completed will be one of the finest stations of the kind in the Dominion. The other matter to which my hon. friend refers has been engaging the attention of the minister and of the officials of the department.

Mr. CHURCH: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the vote for Ontario is most inadequate. You cannot take care of the post office and the custom house for the next fiscal year with this vote. You have no custom house in Toronto; you have simply a vacant lot. Surely you will not leave matters for another twelve months in the position in which they are at present, when the customs house does a business of $50,000,000 a year. Money is being spent in other parts of the country to provide facilities for doing business, but in the case of Toronto you are not giving anything back to the business men, from whom you are getting the money. I hope the minister will take this matter up.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not a local knowledge of the wonderful city which is so ably represented by the distinguished member who has just spoken; but I may say that he has some ground of complaint in reference to the inadequate facilities in the customs house. I am sure the permanent minister of the department will read what the hon. member has said, and I will personally direct his attention to the necessity and wisdom of providing better facilities.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with the casualty clearing station, will the minister tell us what is the reason of that vote?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is for the purpose of settling up with the Canadian National Railways for the site.

Mr. GOOD: I do not see what possible harm can come from leaving this matter over until we have further information. It is evident that nothing can be done this year—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Oh, yes.

Mr. GOOD: —other than to purchase the site, and we have not had sufficient information to enable us to decide as to whether or not that is justifiable.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What information does the hon. member desire? I have told him that this vote does not commit us to any particular site. Its purpose—and this is the uniform practice, and the only way in which it can be done—is to enable the de-

partment to find a suitable piece of ground on which a building can be erected. If we came to the House next session and said "We have bought a site and erected a building for seed purposes," my hon. friend would tell us we had no right to do it, because no vote had been passed. There is only one way by which these things can be done properly, and that is by taking the course we have adopted.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): What is the cost of the building?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): We will have to come to the House next year and get the House to authorize the vote. We cannot spend a five-cent piece without the authority of parliament.

Mr. GOOD: I will tell the minister what we want, and why I think we should object to this item at the present time. We should not embark upon an enterprise of this kind without seeing our way clear and realizing the need. We do not know the need at the present time, and I would want some further information from the Seed Commisisoner himself in regard to the need for this particular building, and also in connection with the impossibility if such there be, of using some of the buildings already in existence for that purpose. I know that at the agricultural college at Guelph, which is not far from Toronto, They have a fine building largely devoted to the same purpose; and in the University of Toronto there are many places which might be used, so far as I know, for a large part of the year for this purpose. At both these places there are fine buildings which are not being used for six months of the year. I would like to have some information which would enable us to justify such an expenditure. What is the use of voting the money for the land, unless we are satisfied the whole project is justifiable? What is the objection to letting this matter stand over? We have been getting on well to-day; let us have full information in the Main Estimates next year. I am not taking an out-and-out stand against this proposition, but we have not sufficient information to justify the appropriation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am afraid it is most difficult to satisfy the hon. member. Here is something primarily and solely in the interests of agriculture, and my hon. friend objects to it. I am afraid I will have to ask my colleague the Minister of Agriculture to explain.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not want to press this matter unduly. If the hon. member has any information he can give the department in regard to some other site where we can get better accommodation, we want it; but I can assure him the work demands accommodation such as we have not had in the past. The work has been neglected for some time for lack of accommodation, We have been in rented quarters not suitable for the purpose. We have not been located permanently, and have had to move from time to time, thus disorganizing the work. What would the hon. member do, if he were in my place? This proposition has grown to great proportions. A large proportion of it is an export trade for which we must keep up the quality of the seed; and to do good work we must have good accommodation. Does the hon. member propose we should defer taking steps for another year? If he, in turn, has some reasons to give me, I will be agreeable to the suggestion to let this stand over until I get such information as will assist me in providing better accommodation in a better city or in a better location. I do not want to be exacting in regard to the matter; but, on the other hand, these are the requirements of my department, as I understand them. We have had difficulties in other cities in getting accommodation. In the city of Quebec, after spending a long time, we have got similar accommodation by renting premises. If my hon. friend has anything that he can furnish me as justification for dropping the matter and neglecting the work for another year, and seeking new temporary accommodation, it may be to our advantage in the end to drop it. I would like to hear from him along that line.

Mr. GOOD: I am not objecting to the carrying on of the work. I know it is important work; but I do object to going into this expenditure, the extent of which we do not know at the present time, without any definite idea as to the needs of this particular matter of looking after our seeds. I have already made suggestions to the Minister of Agriculture regarding the possible utilization of buildings in Toronto and Guelph, which I think are very well suited for the purpose. I think the minister should have something definite from the seed commissioner himself in regard to the expenditure. If he has this information and will submit it to the House and give us the details, we may be in a position to approve, and I for one do not wish to withold my endorsation of the scheme, except that at the present time I do not know and have no information to enable me to form a judgment.

Mr. ROBB: It may be thought a bit extraordinary that a man from Quebec should rise in defence of a proposition in Toronto—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not a Toronto proposition, and that is the reason the minister is up.

Mr. ROBB: I wish to point out that, if a better building is required for the inspection of seed grain and particularly clover and grass seed, for a central location in Ontario, I submit Toronto is the right place to have that building; and I think I can convince the committee why it is more economical. For instance, we have a department of inspection under the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the headquarters for inspection are in Toronto. This grain for export must be inspected and when it goes to the markets of the world must carry the inspector's certificate. There is another reason; the largest exporters of clovers and grass seeds have headquarters in Toronto, where there are two very large firms, and the centre of the clover trade gravitates into Toronto; and I submit, without arguing whether the building is necessary or not, we must accept the statement of the men who are at the head of it, that it is necessary and that Toronto is the proper location; and I am convinced by what has been submitted to us that a better building is required. You cannot put up your machinery for inspecting grain and be under the necessity of moving about every year or two. We should have a permanent building for this work because the clover and grass seed export trade is becoming of enormous benefit to the agricultural districts of this country.

Mr. GOOD: Have we any idea of the total expense which will be involved before this project is completed?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend apparently does not appreciate that all that is being done here is to enable a site to be bought somewhere, not necessarily in Toronto Nothing can be done, no money can be spent in connection with a building, without everything in connection with the matter being submitted first to parliament. All that is involved in this appropriation is a sum of money to purchase a site. If the government comes to parliament later on for an appropriation to erect a building, my hon. friend will be able to go into the question.

Mr. GOOD: The minister would not recommend spending $25,000 to purchase a site if there was some possibility of having the whole thing negatived next year owing to some outrageous expenditure for a building. The first thing we should do is to decide what kind of building is necessary.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): There could be no outrageous expenditure for a building or a dollar spent upon a building without the leave of parliament next year.

Mr. GOOD: I know that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Then why is my hon. friend talking about the country being committed to an expenditure of an outrageous character?

Mr. GOOD: What is the use of buying the land without having an idea as to what sort of building is to be put on it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is putting the cart before the horse. If it is desirable—and the Department of Agriculture says it is—to have a building in connection with their Seed branch, before you can get a building, you must have a property somewhere to put it on. That is all we are proposing to do. Nobody has been committed to an expensive building, and we are not suggesting that anybody should be. Next year the government may ask for an appropriation for a building. If my hon. friend thinks the amount is too large, or the building is in the wrong place, he can argue that out then. The only question at present involved is: Can a site be purchased for the building, not necessarily in Toronto, but anywhere the government may decide that it should be purchased?

Mr. GOOD: Has the Minister of Agriculture a definite recommendation from the Seed Commissioner in this connection?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. The primary object of this laboratory is to give service to the farmers who grow the seed and to maintain the quality, especially for export. I shipped carloads of seed before the western laboratories were opened. I am surprised my hon. friend, who is familiar with the grass seed and clover seed industry, would seem to stand in the way of this enterprise, because it is urgently required. Mr. George Clark is one of the most careful and efficient officers in the service of the Department of Agriculture, and he certainly entered into this matter very carefully before making his recommendation.

Mr. GOOD: Would it not be better for the minister to bring in an estimate next year covering the cost of the land and the building, and then we could consider the whole thing on its merits.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): We are proposing to ask the committee to vote this money. If my hon. friend wants to move against it, he can, but I think we have given

him all the information that can possibly be given.

Mr. SPENCER: I wish to support the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) in his stand. If you are going to buy an expensive lot, surely you have an idea of what sort of building you want to put on it. We should know what expenditure is involved in this. This reminds me of an incident where a lot was bought in a western town some ten years ago for some $10,000, to put a building on. The government never erected a building on that lot, and that lot is worth less than $200 to-day. We should have more details. The hon. member for Brant is on very good ground in the stand he is taking.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is again putting the cart before the horse. He is suggesting, if you are getting a place to install the Seed branch in, you should decide to buy your building before you buy your lot. The first question to be decided is where you want to put your building in Toronto or anywhere else; then you come to parliament and submit your proposal for the building you intend to erect.

Mr. GOOD: I do not suppose there is any use in discussing this particular matter any further. There is another matter, not a very popular subject, to which I wish to call attention, because I think it is my duty to say something about it. Last year I made some comment upon the expense of Government House. There is an item in this appropriation for alterations and improvements to Rideau Hall, $17,100. I have the highest regard personally for the Governor General; but last year I figured up the expense that this country was put to in connection with this institution, and I think the total last year amounted to about $225,000. If I remember aright, there was in the estimates of last year an item of somewhat the same amount for improvements and alterations to Rideau Hall. It seems to me that at this time, when so many people in this country are in dire distress and want, these expenditures are totally unjustifiable. In that particular direction we ought to cut down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend's policy is one that should be considered, but it is never a wise thing for people to allow their buildings to fall down or into disrepair. It is true economy to spend money in order to keep buildings in the necessary repair. Otherwise, when the catastrophe comes in the end, one will find that one was penny wise and pound foolish. This amount of $17,100 is required for alterations to the palm house of the conservatory at Rideau Hall, which is in a very dangerous condition and must be renewed. The work includes alterations to the iron superstructure and steel framing, including the necessary glass, and also repairs to the substructure and foundations and the heating and water services, The reports are that this work is entirely necessary, or otherwise the building will not only fall into disrepair, but be in danger of falling down altogether.

Mr. GOOD: If this is simply a matter of repairs to prevent decay and dilapidation, then I withdraw my objection.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On that matter I notice in the Main Estimates an item has already been passed for Rideau Hall including grounds improvements, and so on, amounting to $60,000. I am glad this matter has been brought up by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). I know some may hesitate to speak of a matter which concerns an official who may be regarded more or less as a guest of this country. However, when we put together the various items concerning the upkeep of Government House, they amount to a very large figure. I am inclined to think the Governor General has been very poorly advised with regard to conditions in Canada and the temper of Canadian people if this style which he has undertaken to keep up, is maintained. I should like to call attention to certain items which I have noticed in various departments and which have their bearing on this particular item: Governor General's salary, $48,666; Governor General's Secretary, $2,400; Governor General's Secretary, office, salaries, $31,915; printing and stationery, $3,000; sundries, one item, for which we have not the detail, $63,000. Under Public Works there is an item in connection with Rideau Hall of $60,000, and now in the Supplementary Estimates the sum of $17,100. Further allowance for fuel and light $19,000. In connection with another department, that of Railways and Canals, we find that for repairs to the Governor General's cars there has already been voted $10,000, and I notice that there is still an item in the Supplementary Estimates of not less than $40,000 additional for repairs. I cannot conceive at all what items can be involved in these large sums. There is nothing whatever down in the list for travelling expenses and I do not know how far the railways supply the equipment for that. I presume, however, that it amounts to a considerable sum. I have not seen in

what department that comes or how it is arranged for, but these items alone that we know of total $295,081.66. When you have an expenditure of nearly $300,000 on one individual whose functions in this country are purely formal, then I suggest that the Governor General has been very ill-advised indeed in maintaining things on such a scale. I think I can speak for a considerable number of people when I say that we have no desire to set up anything like a feudal state over in this country. I take it that the great purpose of the Governor General's having been sent here is that there should be maintained cordial relationships between the Mother Country and Canada. But if this kind of thing persists I am of opinion that instead of maintaining cordial relationships it will rather work the other way and we shall have very strained relations. I do not think that these burdens should be placed upon people who are finding it exceedingly difficult as it is to obtain the merest necessities of life.

Mr. GOOD: I think I called attention last year to the unprecedented extravagance which Ontario, in my judgment, was guilty of a few years ago in building a palace on the Don river, and to the fact that during a coal famine some time ago, when the citizens of Toronto and the people of the province generally were pretty nearly freezing, a single house for just one functionary consumed about one thousand tons of coal. This sort of thing is bound to excite a great deal of resentment and uneasiness in the country and it must come to a stop some time or other.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I realize that a man is on rather dangerous ground when he undertakes to discuss a subject like this; he is apt to be charged with a lack of patriotism if not something worse. But the time has come, I think, when we ought to protest against such expenditures. I do not agree with the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) in attaching any blame in this regard to His Excellency. I think the matter rests entirely with the government; I do not believe His Excellency has anything to do with it; in fact I doubt very much whether he is aware that these votes are in the estimates. The government ought to consider all the circumstances very carefully before asking for these expenditures to be sanctioned.

Mr. BANCROFT: What is the reason for putting in the Supplementary Estimates $75,000 for the Royal Military College at Kingston?

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question as to why certain items were not included in the Main Estimates has already been discussed at some length. It has always been the practice for the engineers to recommend supplementary estimates to cover any expenditures that could not have been decided upon in the Main Estimates. There has never been any objection to this course until the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) developed one of his freak notions on the point. With regard to the expenditure on the Royal Military College, there is an attendance of between 25 and 30 boys who have not proper dormitory accommodations. At present two sleep together and this vote is to provide for a new dormitory.

5 p.m.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have listened with some interest to explanations regarding military colleges, clearing stations, and one thing and another, but when it comes to spending $2,800 for the installation of revolving doors in a Hamilton public building I confess I am somewhat puzzled.

Mr. MEWBURN: I move that that item be struck out. We want to be consistent; we are trying to practise economy and there is no sense in $2,800 being voted for revolving doors in Hamilton.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

Public building—Manitoba—	
Brandon—public building—alterations.. —	$ 2,500 00
Emerson public building—improvements to lighting..	1,200 05
Winnipeg—Elmwood postal station site—local improvement taxes..	1,008 06
Winnipeg—Fort Osborne barracks—improvements to heating..	11,200 00
	$15,908 06

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The first item in this estimate relates to Brandon; some alterations are necessary to the public building. There is an item for improvements to lighting in the Emerson public building, and the sum of $1,008 is being asked for local improvement taxes on the Elmwood postal station site at Winnipeg. The department must pay these taxes the same as any other owner of property. The fourth item is for improvements to Fort Osborne barracks.

Mr. BANCROFT: What is the building at Emerson?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The post office and custom house.

Mr. FORKE: I wonder whether the government is not making a mistake in voting this large sum of money for Manitoba.

Resolution agreed to.

Public buildings—Saskatchewan—	
Maple Creek public building—improvements to heating—revote..	$ 2,100 00
Moose Jaw public building—local improvement taxes..	3,427 14
Moose Jaw customs examining warehouse —local improvement taxes..	1,708 50
Prince Albert public building—local improvement taxes..	1,306 36
Regina public building—improvements to heating..	7,500 00
Weyburn public building—improvements to heating..	4,700 00
	$20,742 00

Mr. SHAW: What is the necessity for so much heating improvement in the Northwest this year? I notice, not only in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan and Alberta as well, large amounts have been necessary for the purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would it not be due to the fact that the heating apparatus is being transformed to permit the use of Alberta coal?

Mr. SHAW: I think not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Evidence given before the committee on that subject has shown that very little if any change is required for the use of Alberta coal.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In regard to the Maple Creek building the Chief Architect states that in his report, dated September 4, 1920, Mr. Thomson, mechanical engineer at Winnipeg, reported that the heating apparatus was in a deplorable condition, that the boiler was totally unable to carry the present load of radiation, and that the latter was inadequate. None of these proposals are made except on the reports of the engineer.

Resolution agreed to.

Public buildings generally—	
Experimental farms—new buildings, additions, alterations, etc..	$ 75,000
Military Hospitals—repairs and improvements—further amount required..	16,000
High Commissioners' Office, London—change of premises..	25,000
Installation of fuel saving devices for public buildings..	12,000
	$128,000

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As to the High Commissioner's office in London: I understand from what has appeared in the public press that at one time we had an option on the Cox Bank building for something like £500,000. If my information is correct—and I do not say that it is; I simply want to get the facts—that option was allowed to lapse and a further option was taken on the same property at about £600,000. That option also has been allowed to lapse, and in the meantime the present premises have been rented over our heads and we have to get out. I would like to know what the real situation is. What is going to be done? Has a syndicate been formed to look after this?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: For about twenty years the different governments in office have sought to obtain suitable quarters in London for the High Commissioner's office. The governments of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa all have suitable buildings there—very much better, indeed, than anything Canada has. I think each government that has been in office has felt that our Dominion was being placed in a false light before all citizens in London at the heart of the Empire. Efforts were made by the late government to secure a suitable building, and when this government came into office the effort was continued. The High Commissioner has gone into the matter very carefully. Last year we thought we had obtained a building that would be suitable, but on giving the matter careful consideration we abandoned the idea of purchasing it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was that the Cox Bank building?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I forget at the moment what building it was. However, this year the High Commissioner did think there was an opportunity of securing the building to which my hon. friend has referred, namely, the Cox Bank building. This building was in course of erection; it was almost completed and there was an exceptional opportunity to obtain it. At one time the government thought it might be wise to secure it, having in mind, of course, the subletting of the greater part of it to different Canadian firms, banks, and so on, that have their offices in London. The High Commissioner went into the question very thoroughly; he felt that if that building could be secured it would pretty well carry itself through the rents to be obtained. However, when he began to negotiate in the matter there were one or two conditions that he did not feel he would be justified in accepting, and he abandoned altogether the thought of taking over the Cox building. He has since been looking at one or two others, but has not yet decided what building he will recommend; and that is where the matter stands. A suitable building in London is urgently required. As my hon. friend has suggested, notice

recently had to be given of our intentions regarding our present offices; unless we took a lease for another term of years it was represented that we would have to relinquish the premises at the expiration of the present lease, about the first of July. The High Commissioner was willing to let the lease lapse rather than renew it for a term of years. As the offices will very shortly have to be vacated and transferred to other quarters until a new building is secured, this item is put in to meet any expenses that may arise in that connection.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it from what the minister says that we are abandoning our present quarters; that we have no other quarters in view, and that this sum is to keep the office running for the year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To cover the period of transition, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Nothing else is being asked for that purpose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the government taken an option for the purchase of a building in London?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not that I am aware of. As I said before my right hon. friend came in, negotiations were under way for the possible acquisition of the Cox Bank building. Those negotiations have been dropped, however, and I think the High Commissioner is at present considering the possibility of securing another building, but has not taken any official action upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No option has been secured?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say that an option has not been secured. I think the High Commissioner has arranged that at any rate before a certain building is disposed of he will be given the refusal of it. More than that I cannot say.

Mr. BAXTER: Sir Henry Thornton may possibly have bought a castle or two in London, and perhaps the thing may come in that way.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I ask whether the question will be considered of assembling all the Canadian offices in London? It seems too bad that the Ontario office should be in the Strand, the British Columbia offices in Pall Mall, and the High Commissioner's office in Victoria street. In the Strand one finds practically all the Australian offices combined in one building, the result being a splendid advertisement for Australia. It struck me as being too bad that a similar situation could not be created for Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad my hon. friend asked that question, because he has reminded me of the fact that last year we tried to acquire the British Columbia building. The federal government would have been prepared to take that building over had the British Columbia government been willing to part with it, but they have found that in that large building, which is so favourably located, they have an excellent investment; as a matter of fact I think they are making money on it. The present situation is that Canada has a much inferior building to that maintained in London by one of its provinces. The federal government rents part of the British Columbia building for offices connected with immigration work. The government has felt that Canada has been handicapped as compared with the other dominions in having its offices scattered about in various buildings throughout London—not only the offices of the different provinces, but the different federal offices that were created during the war. The office which has to do with the soldiers' overseas work is in one part of the city. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has offices for his agents in another part of the city. The immigration offices are in still another part and the High Commissioner's offices are elsewhere. We felt that it was desirable to acquire a building in which all these offices could be brought together and which would be large enough also to accommodate the representatives of the different provinces, but that kind of a building in London is not easily acquired, and rather than make a purchase which would not meet with the general approval of the country we have proceeded slowly in the matter. But the object is to do the very thing my hon. friend has said—to acquire a building that will serve all these purposes in a way that will reflect credit on the country.

Mr. GOOD: I would like some information on the first item in this list "experimental farms, $75,000."

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is for additional buildings, and alterations at the experimental farms throughout the Dominion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What money is to be spent on each farm, and for what purpose in each case?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The statement is as follows:

Ottawa Central Farm	$76,000
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	5,100
Kentville, N.S.	4,000
Nappan, N.S.	3,200
Fredericton, N.B.	6,900
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Que.	1,700
Cap Rouge, Que.	1,600
Lennoxville, Que.	350
La Ferme, Que.	3,700
Kapuskasing, Ont.	1,200
Morden, Man.	6,500
Brandon, Man.	2,900
Indian Head, Sask.	2,900
Scott, Sask.	1,500
Lethbridge, Alta.	1,500
Lacombe, Alta.	500
Summerland, B.C.	5,200
Agassiz, B.C.	2,200
Invermere, B.C.	1,150
Sidney, B.C.	1,900

The total asked for is $130,000 while this vote is for $75,000 and it will be allocated among the different farms.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are the new buildings referred to, and what are their purposes?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): These are buildings which have been recommended by the Department of Agriculture at the different places indicated. I could give my hon. friend the details of any particular place if he wishes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): They are not all going to be new buildings. There are going to be additions and alterations, according to the item. Where is that going to be done?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have given a list of the places where the Department of Agriculture is asking for expenditures to be made, and my hon. friend will find them all in Hansard. The requirements are stated to be $130,000. We are voting here $75,000 which will be spent by the Department of Agriculture among these different places.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I express my opinion in regard to this voting of money for experimental farms? A great deal of it is well expended; it is good work. But I think a great deal of it might well be saved. I would like to have a re-allocation of the expenditure in connection with the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. We are often taunted in this quarter of the House with the amount of money spent on agriculture in this country, and these expenditures on farms and such like are all linked together and the whole sum is hurled at our heads. Now a vast sum of money is spent on the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa for a park. It is a magnificent, delightful show place, it is really a credit to the Dominion and affords delight especially to visitors coming to Ottawa. But at the same time there is no justification for charging up all the expenses of the maintenance of that park to the Department of Agriculture or to its estimates. I would suggest that these expenses be segregated and the money that is spent on the park be charged against the Parks Branch of the Department if the Interior.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have very grave doubts indeed whether any of these experimental farms are of any practical use to the farmer at all. It is true, they raise some very excellent stock and grow fine varieties of different farm products, but these are all produced at a loss. Now, is it any consolation to the ordinary farmer to exhibit to him some very excellent products that are grown at a loss? I think the minister will agree with me that they cannot be grown except at a loss, and I think it is something we should take into serious consideration.

Mr. SPENCER: I would like a little further information in regard to the amount being spent at the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I think the minister said the amount was $76,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The details are as follows: Division of Botany, field laboratory, $4,500; new botanical building, estimated cost, $30,000; extension to chemistry building, $22,000; division of forage plants, frame barn 30 x 50, ground floor and root cellar, $2,000; division of horticulture, greenhouse addition, $15,000; poultry division, new buildings, breeding house, $2,500; making a total of $76,000. That is $1,000 more than the amount we are voting, but my hon, friend will understand that in addition there is the difference between $75,000 and $130,000 which is said to be the estimated expenditure in all parts of the country. This $75,000 we are voting is to be allocated among the whole of these farms after a conference between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The original amount asked for by myself and my staff was $200,000. The amount before parliament is $75,000, and in consequence we shall have to eliminate for the present a lot of the work that can with least disadvantage be done without, though it is all required. This $75,000 will have to be re-allocated to satisfy the most pressing requirements. A lot of the requirements we shall be unable to supply. During the four years of the war no expenditure was made by the late government on buildings for experimental farms. I am not blaming the former

government for that, because they could not very well do otherwise nor in the years following the war could they take any other course. But now the time has come when we must equip these farms with proper buildings or close them up. Is anybody prepared to close them?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Let us close them.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We would like to have some applications during the recess from any province that wants these farms closed. I cannot undertake the responsibility of operating these farms in a half-equipped condition.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Let us close half of them, anyhow.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is not a single dollar asked to be expended that is not most urgently required. I wish some of my friends would go out to the Central Experimental Farm, it is looking very beautiful now. And look at the accommodation we have for the botanical laboratory. You will find, if you put two or three good-sized beds there, you could hardly turn around without knocking over some chemicals. There are three or four men in a cubby-hole of an office where there should be only one. It is a most disgraceful building for an experimental farm system such as we have. Generally speaking, our experimental farms compare favourably with those of other countries, but some of the buildings are disgracefully out of date. I wish hon. gentlemen would go and see that botanical laboratory. We have just recently moved out of another laboratory, the biological laboratory, that we have had to put up with since 1904. There has been absolutely no extension to it for nearly twenty years and this year we were moved into a private building on Wellington street. So far as the departmental buildings and the buildings on the experimental farms are concerned there is not another department of agriculture that I know of on this continent, or anywhere else, that is housed in such poor buildings as the Department of Agriculture of Canada. To the buildings of the experimental farm system the same remarks will apply. I can assure my hon. friend that there is a clear lack in Ottawa in this respect. There are certain laboratories, particularly the botanical laboratory, which are decidedly lacking in suitable accommodation. The botanical laboratory does not possess the accommodation it should in order to cope with such diseases as rust—one of the most virulent and contagious in the entire list—that affect our cereals. Such important problems as these are being studied and dealt with, and yet the quarters of the staff are nothing like what they should be. For experimental work intended to evolve a remedy for rust, an equipment and accommodation of the most efficient character should be provided, and yet we have undertaken an investigation of some of these big problems with accommodation which limits you to 50 per cent of efficiency.

Mr. EVANS: I shall not go as far as the hon. member for Mackenzie and say that these experimental farms are of little or no value. I would say, however, that the Dominion is top-heavy with these institutions at the present time. While agriculture is languishing from one end of the Dominion to the other we are lavishly spending money year after year on these institutions, and I do not think it is right. Very much of the work done, we will say at Ottawa, is also undertaken by the provinces and there is a great deal of overlapping. I wish to protest against the lavish expenditure year after year on these farms.

Mr. GOULD: The minister spoke of the need of more extensive offices in order to enable the scientists attached to his department to carry on their experiments. Let me tell the minister that some of the best work ever done in the interest of agriculture in the Dominion was done outside—it was not done in those offices. I have in mind a certain incident which occurred some years ago in connection with cut-worm. An active educational propaganda was being carried on by the department in order to try and combat the ravages of the cut-worm, and a number of pamphlets were issued on the subject. I know a boy, only twelve years old at that time, who collected evidence out in a summer fallow field that entirely upset the theory advanced in these pamphlets in respect to the cut-worm. According to that theory cut-worms were supposed to hide themselves beneath the surface of the ground during the hours of daylight. Yet this boy I speak of gathered no less than sixteen different specimens out of thousands, yes millions, of worms, which were crawling all over that field between the hours of eleven and twelve o'clock in the day. At that time the rays of the sun were pouring down with intense heat; I would say the temperature must have been 90 degrees in the shade. According to the teaching of the pamphlet these cut-worms should all have been under the surface of the ground at that time, but there they were travelling in all directions—north, south, east and west.

Now as to the expenditure on experimental farms. The actual work of agriculture is car-

ried on, in many cases, hundreds and thousands of miles away from the Central Experimental farm. This vote proposes to expend $75,000 on the Central farm, and the balance on experimental farms at other points. In my opinion this proportion is not right. We who come here for a number of months every year, and have an opportunity of visiting the Central Experimental farm, are pleased to know that its status compares favourably with that of similar institutions in other countries, but it is on the provincial farms that the actual work is carried on and the facilities there are not such as they ought to be. I think the allocation which is being made is not in proportion to the necessities of the case; a larger amount should be expended at outside points, particularly in the grain areas of the West.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend did not catch my statement when I pointed out that inasmuch as the vote for outside work had been reduced by more than one-half we would have to have a re-allocation. I will keep my hon. friend's suggestion in mind when we make that re-allocation. We were to get $200,000 when the estimates were first sent in. The amount has been reduced; therefore we will have to have a re-allocation.

Mr. GOULD: I would urge upon the minister that when he is making a re-allocation a larger proportion should go to the provinces.

Mr. GOOD: When the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were under consideration on a former occasion the question of overlapping as between the provincial departments and the federal department was mentioned. This has been a serious matter for some time and undoubtedly there has been a waste of money in that way. I think the minister stated last year that the matter was under consideration. I should like to ask him if anything has been done in the meantime to prevent that overlapping, and if not whether he contemplates taking any action?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a work which has to be undertaken gradually because it always involves a certain amount of disruption, especially when the provinces are more or less associated with the federal authorities. I may say that I have been in touch with the provinces in regard to the matter of overlapping and there is a satisfactory desire to co-operate in the matter. I had an opportunity of visiting the outside experimental farms and inspecting their work, more particularly in the province of Saskatchewan. We have a large number of illustration farms there consisting of forty acres each. The University of Saskatchewan has the province mapped out into areas and is engaged in the same kind of work. We arranged that as soon as their plans were completed for this class of work we would retire and leave the field to them. Inasmuch as there has been no capital expenditure there will be no loss involved. In the live stock line, and every other activity, we are working in the direction suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. CHURCH: Has the minister any hundred dollar coal scuttles out at this farm?

Item agreed to.

Ottawa—new departmental building—compensation to architects for designs submitted, $30,000.

Mr. GOOD: We should like to have some explanation of this vote?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The committee will remember that earlier in the afternoon I referred to the fact that a large number of buildings and a tract of land on Wellington street had been expropriated and taken over by the government in 1913 with a view of doing away with the present system of renting buildings throughout the city and concentrating all the offices that were not in buildings owned by the government in that particular area. On April 14, 1913, an order in council was passed providing for a competition for designs for a new departmental block on Wellington street to cost from ten to twelve million dollars. That amount seems very large to-day when we look at the proposals for the construction of buildings, but that idea was in the mind of the government of the day in 1913. The Minister of Public Works appointed assessors to judge the designs. Conditions governing the competition were drawn up. The competition was advertised. Plans were received up to April 2nd, 1914. British and Canadian architects to the number of 59 submitted designs. Each set of plans consisted of from 18 to 30 drawings. It is estimated that the draughtsmanship alone cost the architects not less than $177,000. This only takes into account draughting—not the higher work of designing. Up to the present no competitor has received any return for his labour or expense. The conditions provided that of the competitors six should be chosen. These six were to make any further preliminary drawings required by the assessors. The assessors were then to choose from the six the one having the best design. The one selected was to be employed to carry out the work. The others were each to receive $3,000

Mr. GOOD: The others of the six.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The others of the six were each to receive $3,000. The assessors out of the designs submitted selected the best six. Beyond this point the competitors did not proceed. The immediate delay was said to be caused by the desire to wait for the report of the Federal Town Planning Commission. Finally the war put an end to the whole thing. The six best designs having been chosen, the other competitors had no grievance. They were out of the race. The only question remaining was the remuneration which should be paid the six architects successful, in the first stage. The six successful competitors asked for settlement, but nothing satisfactory was offered. One of them, Saxe & Archibald of Montreal then took the matter to the Exchequer Court. Suit was brought to recover $100,000, the amount allowed by the architects tariff for the province of Quebec for preparing and furnishing preliminary plans, being 1 per cent on $10,000,000, the estimated cost of the buildings. The matter was dealt with in the Exchequer Court. The Crown had tendered $3,000, and judgment was given for this amount. Last session $3,000 for each of the six architects was placed in the Estimates. This the architects refused to accept, and they put forward this claim:

1. The plans called for were not mere sketches. They consisted of from 18 to 30 large drawings. The sum of $3,000 would not pay for the work of the draughtsman alone.

2. In addition to what the architects had to pay for draughting they had other expenses incidental to studying the problems presented. One of the architects has produced vouchers showing that he actually disbursed over $9,000.

3. This work was done prior to April 2nd, 1914. The architects have been out their money for nine years. The lowest prize offered, namely $3,000, would with interest now amount approximately to $5,000.

4. This was no ordinary undertaking. It was the designing of a public building to cost over $10,000,000. The plans represented all the thought and genius these men were able to bring to the work. Other plans would have been necessary, but they would have been a matter of elaboration merely. The conception with all the effort involved was in these plans.

5. Among the six men was the one who must have been entrusted with the work of erecting the building. No one of these architects would have considered competing for a prize of $3,000 or of $10,000. What each struggled for was the first prize, the honour of doing the work and the fee that went with it. It is submitted that it is unfair for the government of Canada to set 59 architects or firms of architects working for prizes and then when they have done the largest part of their work to say that there shall be no first prize—merely consolation prizes. Since it is now impossible to say which of the six should get the first prize the only thing that remains is to divide some part of it at least among the six.

Clause 28 of the general conditions provided that if the government abandoned the work or failed to give instructions within twelve months from the selection of the successful architect he should be paid a sum equal to 1¼ per cent of the amount of the estimated expenditure. The amount to be divided by the government amongst these six architects would therefore have been as follows:

1¼ per cent on estimated cost of $10,000,000..	$125,000
$3,000 to each of the five other competitors..	15,000
	$140,000

The architects think that they should be given at least $10,000 each. This would not do more than cover the ordinary draughting and other expenses incidental to the work. It would leave nothing for the work of the architects themselves. That is the whole situation, and the department submits to the House the suggestion that it is reasonable under the circumstances that these men having done this work should be paid. It is only honest and proper on the part of the government to do that which any individual would have done if he were in the same position. That is the position in which ths vote stands. Among the first six whose plans were approved by the assessors this amount of $30,000 would be divided.

Mr. FORKE: Has the minister the names of the different architects and their places of residence?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Messrs. Saxe and Archibald, Montreal; MacFarlane and Ranie, Montreal; Robb and Mitchell, Montreal; Hutchinson, Wood and Miller, Montreal; W. E. Noffke, Ottawa and D. A. Moodie, London, England. The men who submitted plans were from all over the world. These men whose names I have mentioned were among the first six.

Mr. FORKE: How long is it since these first plans were drafted?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In 1913-14

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do recall this matter. I recall resisting these claims for some years. Apparently, the government has let it be a case of "heads I win and tails you lose." Archibald went to court and got $3,000, which was the amount to go to each of the six leading architects. So the government introduced an estimate to pay the same amount to each of the others. It seems to me that was right. But now the man who went to court and got the judgment for $3,000 is going to get $5,000 more. The government brings in an estimate which will pay them a total of $8,000 apiece.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, $5,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought there was $3,000 apiece paid last year?

Mr. MACDONALD: No, that was not accepted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That collapsed?

Mr. MACDONALD: No, the architects took the ground that, as professional men having given their very best services in the matter, they would not take it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood they got the $3,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have not received anything yet?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the value of the Exchequer Court action?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The situation was that the Crown at the time tendered $3,000 to Messrs. Saxe and Archibald.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then Archibald withdrew his action?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, the court held, on purely technical grounds, that the war rendered it impossible for the Crown to proceed with the buildings, and that therefore the Crown could not carry out its contract. One of the matters among the questions of law decided by the Exchequer Court was that the Crown was not liable technically but the Crown had tendered $3,000. The conclusion of the judgment reads:

> The suppliants are not entitled to any portion of the relief sought by their petition of right but through the benevolence of the Crown expressing its willingness to pay them $3,000, there will be judgment accordingly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is rather an amusing incident.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is peculiar.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We know they do some funny things through the use of the word "technical." The court held that as a matter of law, because of the intervention of that Great War—at least such was one reason—the government was not liable. How was that technical? I do not think anything could be very much more substantial. The court held the government was not liable, but the government came along and offered, as a matter of grace, $3,000. Judgment accordingly was entered for that amount and the government is ready to pay it—I do not think any exception is made—but because they do not take it we are ready to pay $2,000 more apiece. Does the minister propose to come back next year in case they do not take this?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia, $533,884.60.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is Resolution No. 502 carried?

The CHAIRMAN: This resolution, No. 504, is the only Public Works vote left, and one item of it, in connection with Little Anse, is still not carried.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That stands.

Resolution stands.

National Defence—award to Major H. R. Northover in full settlement of all claims for inventions on Colt machine guns during the war, $5,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: May we have some explanation in connection with this matter?

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): It is proposed to ask this amount in full settlement of all claims made against the government of Canada for inventions used on Colt machine guns by Major Northover. This officer claimed, from the Canadian government, a sum of $47,267 for royalty on his inventions as follows:

1,001 gas cylinders at $20 each	$20,020
1,196 side attachments at $20 each	23,920
363 auxiliary mountings at $5 each	1,815
5,688 belt boxes at 25 cents each	1,422
Samples and drawings	90
Total	$47,267

These were articles which were used during the war. The British government awarded him £1,700 as royalty on the following:

100,521 feed belt boxes	£1,500
210 gas cylinders and gas lever attachments thereto	200

Canada's award on the same lines would be $12,475.27. The department, however, offered Major Northover, and he has agreed to accept $5,000 in full settlement of his claim. This is in full discharge of his claim. It is a relic of the war situation.

Item agreed to.

Annual drill—further amount required, $8,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) here?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this going back to militarism?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No. This is to assist the gathering of the clans which I hope my right hon. friend will attend when the Highland regiments of Nova Scotia will be together on the 15th July.

Mr. GOULD: I notice, taking the two items 470 and 471 in conjunction, that the same condition obtains under the present regime which obtained under the past regime, and of which I frequently complained. I refer to the fact that the amount for salaries and wages exceeds the amount for annual drill.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me call this carried, and then my hon. friend can speak on item 471.

Mr. GOULD: I was just drawing the attention of the committee to the fact that the amount for salaries and wages exceeds the amount for annual drill.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Annual drill is one item and salaries and wages another.

Mr. GOULD: Then I maintain that the order should be reversed. That is my protest. If proficiency in annual drill is the thing that we are after we should change the order of things.

Mr. GRAHAM: The $10,000 item is civil, not military.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Item 470 is "annual drill, further amount required." Why should it be put in that way, if it is really a vote to make a success of this gathering of the clans?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is not that. The situation is this: In Nova Scotia, this amount is to be used supplemental to the general vote for annual drill, because the Highland battalions in Nova Scotia are going to camp for some twelve days. This was not contemplated at the time the regular vote for annual drill was put through last winter. It is also due to the fact that they are going to camp in greater strength and numbers than they otherwise would. That is the explanation of the extra amount?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose they are going in greater strength and numbers on account of this celebration?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) That is one of the reasons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Hector appropriation of $15,000 is towards the same celebration?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That does not come under the Department of National Defence.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it is toward the same object.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will these events synchronize in any way with the byelection in Pictou?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I wish to protest against votes being granted for local purposes, such as celebrations of this kind. If some of the people down in Nova Scotia want to have a celebration in connection with some historic event, they have a perfect right to do so; but the situation is different when the whole of this country, with commitments as they are at present, is asked to contribute money for that purpose. We can just as well get up a celebration in Manitoba, or the people of British Columbia could do the same. There are a hundred local places which have a perfect right, since they have some historic background, to get up a celebration, and if one particular section does this, I cannot see why a hundred other sections cannot do so with equal right. I for one object decidedly to granting appropriations of this character. This is evidently a camouflaged item, this being brought under the military department, and another item being brought under a different department entirely.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this connected with another item, the Hector item in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Are these two different celebrations?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have already answered the right hon gentleman (Mr. Meighen) who is my hon. friend's leader. The Highland battalions of Nova Scotia are going to camp early in July. This was not contemplated at the time when the main vote for annual drill was decided upon. The vote for the celebration has nothing to do with the military side of the matter.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have no objection to the annual drill, but if this is in connection with the historical celebration, I have something to say in connection with the matter.

Mr. GOULD: I would gather from this that the activities that took place on the water last year, as represented by the $5,000 appropriation for the international boat race are being repeated on land this year, and the amount is increased by $3,000.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In the Main Estimates the vote for salaries and wages for 1923-24 was $250,000. This was an increase of $25,000 over the previous year and was intended to cover additional salaries required to be paid to civilians employed at the Tuxedo barracks hospital formerly used for war patients, but lately converted into a station hospital for the permanent and non-permanent militia. When this hospital was used for war patients, the cost of maintenance was charged to adjustment of war claims, but now it is chargeable to militia votes, the civil salaries being chargeable to salaries and wages. Upon completing the reorganization of the hospital on a peace basis, it was found that the salaries of civil employees would make an annual charge of $29,000 for which only $25,000 additional was included in the estimates, leaving an excess of $4,000 for which no provision was made. Although the most rigid economy has been exercised in the past year, it has been impossible to avoid an overdraft of $1,634.99 notwithstanding that the staff of caretakers, and so forth, for building and properties generally has been reduced to the minimum essential to the proper care and prevention of damage by frost and other causes.

With the additional amount now asked for there will be provided only enough funds to pay the staff now employed in which there have been no increases over 1922-23, except as mentioned above, and a small margin of $4,-365.00 for contingent and unforeseen purposes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do I understand that this vote No. 470 is to provide for the drill of Scottish Highlanders in connection with the Scottish celebration that is to take place in July?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, this is for the regular drill.

Mr. CALDWELL: But it will come off at the same time. Shall we be allowed to discuss these two votes together?

The CHAIRMAN: Item 470 has been carried.

Mr. FIELDING: The Hector item comes up later.

Mr. CALDWELL: If these two events are going to be held in conjunction with each other—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): They have nothing to do with each other.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then in that case I will reserve my remarks in regard to the Hector vote until it comes up.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will these two things come off at the same time?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am really surprised that my hon. friend, who is a good Scotsman, should be so incredulous. The two regiments in Nova Scotia comprising about 1,000 men go into camp about the 7th of July. They are usually in camp for ten days and this vote is to defray the expenses in connection with that annual drill. On the 15th, 16th and 17th of July there is to be held in the same county a celebration commemorative of the landing of the first Scottish settlers in Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): If the minister will come out openly and say that these two matters are one and the same—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): They are not.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): —I will hold up both hands for it. But I do not think it is fair to combine the annual drill and the Scottish celebration in this camouflaged way. I think we deserve something better.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is displaying an attitude which I do not think is quite Scottish in character. An annual camp has always been held in eastern Nova Scotia, in Pictou and in Cape Breton. This year they are being concentrated in Pictou county and arrangements are being made for the regular annual drill. The fact that this Scottish celebration takes place at the same time is what Sir Thomas White would call "a mere coincidence."

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not want it to be thought that I am opposing anything in connection with that celebration because I have a great admiration for the Scottish people, being of Scottish descent myself. We have a very excellent Scottish colony in my riding. They arrived here fifty years ago next month, and I have an invitation to assist in my small way at the fiftieth anniversary to be celebrated on July 10. Will the minister extend any assistance in that case?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Have you any Highland regiments in New Brunswick?

Mr. CALDWELL: My hon. friend is minister and he can answer that question better than I can. I do not know whether we have.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not think so.

Mr. CALDWELL: But I have seen the kilts in New Brunswick on many occasions.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is no doubt a coincidence that the holding of the camp and this celebration should occur at the same time, and

if it is I think it is a fortunate and happy coincidence. It is something that will give many people in this country a great deal of pleasure and I believe that it will contribute to the success of the celebration of a great historic event in this country.

Mr. SPENCER: In what part of Nova Scotia is the camp being held?

Mr. MACDONALD: In the county of Pictou.

Item agreed to.

Compassionate grant to C. Peachy, $33.

This man was caretaker at headquarters at Regina and the grant is made on account of his having been hurt in the execution of his duties.

Item agreed to.

Engineer services and works—further amount required, $16,700.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The following is the report on this item.

Since the Main Estimates were submitted a considerable amount of work has become necessary which could not be foreseen previously.

The following two services, which could not be foreseen when the Main Estimates were put forward, are now considered to be very necessary:

(a) To provide accommodation for ordnance stores, Esquimalt, by utilizing certain naval coal stores, Esquimalt, $7,700.

(b) To provide accommodation for Royal Canadian Regiment, Wolseley Barracks, London, Ont., $9,000.

The ordnance stores at Esquimalt are at present situated in a rented building, for which the government pays a rental of $3,600 per year. Naval coal sheds No. 2 to 5 have been offered for use as ordnance stores but are required to be fitted up, at a cost of $7,700. A saving in rental will ultimately be made.

Certain of the temporary buildings erected during the war at Tecumseh barracks, London, were reported on by the Colonel Commandant as infected with dry rot to such an extent that, in the interest of economy, it will not be advisable to make any further repairs. These buildings are also very inflammable and loss of life might result in case of fire.

The Colonel Commandant recommends that these buildings be condemned as quarters for soldiers and that a portion of Wolseley barracks be fitted up at an estimated cost of $9,000 to accommodate about 90 all ranks of the Royal Canadian Regiment, including regimental orderly room, cook house, etc. The portions of Wolseley barracks being refitted are:

Block "A",
Old barrack store building, block "B",
Old A.S.C. bunk house, block "G",
Old supply store, block "K",
Old supply store, block "L".

The above have been used chiefly as offices and barracks stores and have to be fitted up as single officers' quarters, barrack rooms for single men and other necessary regimental accommodation.

Item agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. MEIGHEN

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the House rises I want to refer to a report in the afternoon papers of my remarks this morning. There is nothing substantially wrong with the report, but it uses an expression which I did not use and which I do not care to have attributed to me. The report states that I said that the Belle River wharf was in the hands of "God and Tim." There must be something wrong with the hearing apparatus of the representatives of the press.

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

After Recess

PRIVATE BILL

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 251 (from the Senate), for the relief of Flossie May Pinkham.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The desire was expressed by some of the hon. members of the House that an opportunity should be given for discussing the Imperial conference and the Imperial Economic conference. I think possibly it would be advisable to take up these items at once so that there may be opportunity for the members to discuss them perhaps at greater length than if we delayed the discussion till another sitting.

Amount required for expenses of delegation to Imperial conference, $10,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One would hardly think that this was such an occasion that hon. members had in mind to discuss what should be the conduct of the Canadian representatives at this conference or at the Imperial Economic conference. The House is the place to discuss that, and a day should have been set. This is not doing anything. Of course, we have a right I suppose to discuss the subject on this vote and in committee, but there is no concession here by the government at all. I understood from the answer given to an hon. gentleman on my left—I do not remember who it was—that a day would be fixed for this discussion, and that hon. members would know when it was so that they could prepare themselves for the occasion. This is no time for a discussion of that sort, and for a statement by the government of its intentions at the conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say to my right hon. friend that I stated on two or three occasions when the opportunity would be given. I have before me the remarks I made and which appear in Hansard. On two occasions I mentioned that when the Supplementary Estimates were brought down they would contain an item with reference to the Imperial Conference and the Economic Conference, and that ample opportunity would be afforded members to discuss the whole question when that item was considered. The government as a matter of fact felt there would be greater freedom if the discussion took place in committee in the form in which it is now suggested. The last reference I made to the subject was in reply to my hon. friend the member for Brant (Mr. Good). The hon. member's question and my reply thereto appear in Hansard of June 22nd, as follows:

Mr. Good: When will the House have an opportunity of discussing the agenda of the Imperial Conference and the Economic Conference to be held this fall?

My reply was:

I have mentioned, I think, several times, that when the supplementary estimates are brought down, they will contain an item to make provision for the Economic Conference and the Imperial Conference, and that will be the appropriate time, I think, for the discussion to take place. I hope the supplementary estimates will be brought down possibly by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

I think it is perfectly clear to every member of the House that this was the time when the discussion would take place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not a discussion in the House at all, this is a discussion in committee; the main point is not there. It is not appropriate to discuss in committee a subject of this magnitude and character and it has never been the practice to do so. We do not know—

Mr. VIEN: Will my right hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. VIEN: What is the difference between a discussion in committee and a discussion in the House? Everybody is present now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, everybody is present, but if the hon. gentleman does not know the difference I do not think I will take time to explain it.

Mr. VIEN: You will be much freer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My point is this: No hon. member of the House knew this item was coming up now. We are called upon without one moment's notice to discuss what is to be the policy adopted by Canada at an economic conference, and if the government think that is reasonable I am quite sure the House does not. The papers on the subject are not yet down. Some time ago I asked for and obtained what was described at the time as a partial list of the subjects that had been suggested for discussion—suggested from Great Britain. I cannot speak with certainty as to the exact words of the Prime Minister, but I have the impression that he promised to give later any other subjects that were submitted for discussion so that we would have the agenda and have some little time to consider it before the time would be fixed for discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my right hon. friend will allow me to say to him that I complied with that intention on the 5th June. I then gave to the House such further statements as I had received from the Home government. I would further say to my right hon. friend that there is before the House at the present time all the information that the government has received and which it is at liberty to place on the table. All the papers are down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the full agenda now ready for discussion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The whole agenda so far as the government has received it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the government prepared to state what its position is to be in reference to these subjects?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In so far as it is possible to state it. I notice that when my right hon. friend was similarly situated he indicated that he did not think he should be asked to state what his position would be at the conference, inasmuch as it was impossible to do so until he was in conference with the other parties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that is absolutely the right stand but I did not expect it to come from the Prime Minister because he took the other view. I think the stand I took is right and should be his stand to-day. I was, however, met with a resolution of instructions which the Prime Minister supported, or rather which he moved. I was supposed to go tied round the neck with a lasso on a resolution moved by himself. I am glad his opinions in that respect are now reformed.

Mr. VIEN: No, you needed it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman seems to have risen to be a critic on this subject now.

Mr. VIEN: I say no, that you needed it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Possibly that is the opinion of the hon. member. As to whether it is the opinion of the country or not I will offer no comment at the moment. However, I am glad the hon. member is not to be one of the delegates himself. What I am asking for was a discussion in the House. If the government insist upon having that discussion in committee they will have to carry their insistence, but I do think the House is entitled to a little notification in advance of the time when discussion will take place on such an important matter as this.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Good rising at the same time.

Mr. GOOD: Are we discussing the item?

The CHAIRMAN: We are.

Mr. GOOD: I came in about two or three minutes late.

Mr. CAHILL: Try and get here on time and save us a lot of trouble.

Mr. GOOD: I wonder, Mr. Chairman if the Prime Minister would agree to bring this matter up to-morrow morning at eleven o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not at all.

Mr. GOOD: I am prepared to go ahead with whatever information I may have in regard to the question if the rest of the committee are satisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I came down without any notes or papers and, perhaps, the committee will be very glad. In fact my experience this session has led me to believe that sometimes the support which one may expect or get will be in an inverse ratio to the amount of evidence one can bring forward to support his position. At least that might be a logical deduction from our experience in one of the committees.

Mr. NEILL: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) has the floor or had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He thinks he has.

Mr. JACOBS: It is usual for the Chairman to decide who has the floor. He has decided against me.

Mr. NEILL: I beg to draw attention to what happened. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier was on his feet and the hon. member for Brant interpolated more or less on a point of order, wanting to discuss the course being pursued on the same lines that the leader of the Opposition did. When he concluded his objections it appears to me it was then the privilege of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier to go on with his remarks. The hon. member for Brant having told us that he has not got his notes, he can avail himself of the opportunity to obtain them while my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) is speaking.

Mr. GOOD: I did not know that the hon. member had begun to discuss the matter. I will gladly give way to him.

Mr. BUREAU: It will give you time to get your notes.,

Mr. GRAHAM: Everybody would make better speeches without notes.

Mr. JACOBS: I gladly accept the support of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). I hope when my remarks are concluded he will still continue to give me support.

At the last Imperial Conference, Mr. Chairman, a resolution was proposed and carried in the following terms:

> The conference while reaffirming the resolution of the Imperial War Conference of 1918, that each community of the British Commonwealth should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction of immigration from any of the other communities, recognizes that there is an incongruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in other parts of the Empire. The conference accordingly is of the opinion that in the interests of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth, it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized.

This resolution was supported by the then Prime Minister, now the leader of the Opposition, who was present at the conference; and in passing I wish to say that I commend the conduct of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion. No matter how opposite political views may be, I am glad to bear public tribute to him, putting it in the words of Kipling—

> 'E's a poor benighted 'eathen,
> But a firstclass fighting man

The leader of the Opposition receives a considerable share of support from the people of the province of British Columbia. I do not say they are benighted heathens away out there, but for reasons which I am not going to discuss here, a large portion of the delegation on the other side of the House supports the hon. leader of the Opposition; and notwithstanding that,

he was prepared to back up this resolution, which I understand is not particularly popular in British Columbia. No matter what the views of the people of any particular province may be on a matter of this kind, I submit they ought to give way to the generally accepted views of the people of the Dominion of Canada as a whole and to the views of the Empire of which we are always proud to say we form an integral part. The question of the Hindu franchise is of great interest to this country. There is no reason in the wide world, so far as I can see, why British subjects domiciled in Canada should be deprived of the franchise. They are British-born. Their skins may be a little duskier than ours, but they belong to the Aryan race, and in all respects they are quite as capable of using the franchise as any person who resides in this country. The franchise is given to the Chinese and the Japanese in eight provinces. I understand that in British Columbia they do not vote, but there is a vast difference between the Chinese and Japanese and the Hindu. The first difference is that these latter people are British subjects and are part of the British Empire.

Mr. McBRIDE: Does the hon. member think it is right that a lawyer should have the privilege of pleading his client's case in this House?

Mr. JACOBS: In answer to the hon. member, I would say that these people are not clients of mine. I would be very glad, indeed if they were because I understand they are a highly moral people, a respectable people, and that they pay legal fees when they are due. I cannot say as much for many of the white clients who come to my office. I was going to remark, Mr. Chairman, that the Hindu citizens have a big claim upon us by reason of the fact that they are part of the British Empire. The Chinese and Japanese come to this country. They have to be naturalized as British citizens. They forswear their allegiance to the country from which they come, and they are essentially a different race from the Hindus. They belong to what is known as the yellow race. I do not want to go into the question as to whether it is well to permit large numbers of people of this kind to come into this country or not because it is not a matter which concerns me just now. This question was urged upon the delegates at the Imperial Conference by the Right Hon. Mr. Sastri, who travelled through the country last year, and made what I consider an irrefutable case for his people who are resident here.

There are, I understand, 1,200 Hindus resident in Canada to-day. These people came here ten or twelve years ago. Hon. members will recollect that there was some question about their landing at the time. But they subsequently were permitted to land, and from that time until now they have been denied the right to which they are entitled; that is the right of the franchise which every person coming to this country ought to be given. It may be argued that if we give these people a foothold in this country they will increase and multiply, and after a time this country will no longer be a so-called white country. In answer to that objection, I say that no Hindus are now permitted to leave India for the purpose of coming to Canada to reside. Before it is possible for any of these people to leave their own country they must obtain a passport and a certificate from the Indian government, and that has been consistently refused in the interests of harmony with this country. No more of these people are permitted to come to Canada, and consequently we are only dealing with a handful of 1,200 people, who are, as I understand, all residents today in British Columbia. Mr. Sastri stated when he was here that he was delighted to know at the time that our government was going to fall in with the views of the representatives and delegates at the conference, but he said he found to his bitter experience that the intellectual acceptance of a theory sometimes was very far from its practical application, and he found, so far as this government seemed to be concerned, that there was no intention of putting into effect the promise given by the then Prime Minister of Canada at the conference.

If that be so, Mr. Chairman, it puts the right hon. leader of the Opposition in a very peculiar position. He found that he was putting his signature to a document which was not recognized, or is not recognized, by the present government. He is very much in the position of Mr. Woodrow Wilson after he had signed the Treaty of Versailles and returned to Washington, and found that the Senate refused to back up the solemn undertaking given by him. Surely, we do not want the present leader of the Opposition to become the Woodrow Wilson of this country. No, I think it is our duty to see to it that this undertaking given by him, properly delegated as he was, should be carried out. Those of us who had the pleasure of listening to Mr. Sastri when he was here were very much struck by his argument in favour of the inclusion of his countrymen in the franchise of this country. He pointed out that

India at the present time was disturbed by sedition. The Ghandi propaganda was generally accepted throughout India, and these people in India were making capital out of the fact that the sister commonwealths were not carrying out the undertaking which had been given to them at the conference.

I submit this is a very serious matter, and it is a matter of Imperial concern. We can understand 300,000,000 of people who are being fed with seditious matter using objections of this kind with the very greatest effect in their own country. Hon. members will recollect that last September,—I think it was September or October—we were nearly drawn into war in the matter of the Angora situation. The people of India, as we know, were practically on the crater of a volcano. It is a very simple matter to declare a civil war in Islam, and if that were done, the fat would be in the fire as far as India was concerned. All those considerations were something to be carefully thought over, and I am sure the statesmen gathered round the board at the Imperial conference did think matters of this kind over before they came to the conclusion, that in this particular matter, the commonwealths ought to listen to the combined reason of those who were present, and carry out the views of Mr. Sastri and the Indian delegates.

It was also pointed out some time ago that, as regards India nationally and in its relation to the sister Dominions that country stands practically in the same position as any of the self-governing nations constituting the British Empire. It may be—and I concede the point—that as regards the internal affairs of India, they may not have the same degree of constitutional liberty which we in this country have or which the other commonwealths have. But as I said before, with regard to the dominions constituting the British Empire, India is treated in exactly the same way as the other dominions, and consequently when we deal with the inhabitants of India we have to deal with them in the same way as we deal with the people of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and the other self-governing commonwealths. I should like to learn if it is the intention of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the other delegates who attend this conference, to carry out the undertakings given by our delegates at the last conference, or whether we intend to embark upon some new policy and to deny to those people the right to which I claim they are justly entitled.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the undertaking?

Mr. JACOBS: The undertaking as conveyed in this resolution which I read at the opening of my remarks.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To what extent does my hon. friend read into that paragraph an obligation on the part of the government of Canada?

Mr. JACOBS: I think the moral obligation is clearly seen there:

> The conference while reaffirming the resolution of the Imperial War conference of 1918, that each community of the British commonwealth should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities, recognized that there is an incongruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in other parts of the Empire.

They say that this was the incongruity and that this was recognized by the conference of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, and he agreed to the resolution.

As I said before, I should like to learn what will be the position of the Prime Minister on this important question before the conference. It might be well that there should be an expression of opinion from this House on the matter so that his hands may be strengthened when he appears before that body as a member of the conference. So far as I can see, no valid reason can be urged against granting this franchise to those people. I have yet to learn any good reason which can be urged. I am sure the leader of the Opposition still has the same views on this question as he had in 1921. I heard him in a public address in Montreal, at a meeting at which Mr. Sastri was present, declaring that his views had not changed up to that time, and I have reason to believe that they are identically the same as they were then.

It is not a good thing for any country to have within its borders any people or class of people who are half slave and half free. Any person who is permitted to live in this country and who is denied the franchise, although he is a tax-payer of the country, is deprived of some of his liberties and is half free. I would rather keep those people out of this country altogether, debar them at the gates and not permit them to enter, than allow them to enter and then treat them as if they were not the equals of ourselves and as if they were slaves. I know the Prime Minister has certain notions on this matter, and I should be glad to hear them. It might be argued that this rule excluding the Hindus

from the franchise obtains only in British Columbia; that British Columbia is one of nine provinces; that in the other eight provinces or in eight-ninths of the Dominion of Canada they have the same rights as people of the white races, and that they ought to be satisfied with eight-ninths of the bargain and let it go at that.

Mr. CARROLL: Are the Hindus debarred from the federal franchise in British Columbia?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, and debarred also from the local franchise in British Columbia. It ought to be borne in mind, and I am sure it will be noted by every person in this House that inasmuch as the twelve hundred of these Hindus are residing in that one-ninth of the country where they are debarred the privilege of voting, the eight-ninths amount to nothing at all; that we may as well bar them altogether as bar them in the province in which they have elected to reside. Therefore, I claim we would be doing our duty as citizens of the British Empire in granting this franchise to the Hindus. We would be carrying out the undertaking of the leader of the Opposition, and we ourselves would be benefiting by the fact that every person who comes to this country, who has a stake in the community, who pays his taxes and who is an honourable citizen, should be given the same rights as we have, whether his skin be dark or fair. I should be glad to hear the views of the Prime Minister on this subject.

Mr. NEILL: I propose to deal only very briefly with the remarks of the hon member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), who has expressed the desire to allow Hindus to vote in Canada, and to deal for a moment with the allegations—I will not call them arguments, because that would be sophistical —with which he attempted to buttress his position. I apologize to the House for proposing to take up time at this late hour of the session. It is only the urgent necessity of the case that compels me to do so. I wish the limits of the narrow confines of parliamentary language allowed me to express as the poet says "in language warm as could be breathed or penned" my opinion of the hon. gentleman in precipitating this subject into the political arena at this late hour. I am sorry to see that several of the members for British Columbia either are not in the House or have left. Consequently it behooves the one or two who are here to speak for the province. There is little difficulty in that because we know British Columbia is a unit on the subject. I can well say that this is neither the time nor the place to discuss this subject.

The hon. gentleman based his remarks upon the resolution which he read from the order paper, a resolution which stands and has been standing in his name for nearly five months. We have been sitting through the apparently interminable length of this long weary session, not having accomplished very much either, as some people think, and that resolution was on the Order Paper and it was passed over again and again either at the wish of the hon. member himself or because he was not present to do his duty in the House, while members from British Columbia have been sitting here in session day and night attending to the business. The hon. member reminds me of a beautiful butterfly; he descends at periods. Or like a comet he comes along with a very doubtful periodicity and tells the House to do thus and so, and then flits away to some other scene or field of activity, or of rest and repose. Whether it is relaxation in the way of business, pleasure, or passion, I know not. It is for him to say. But I do know that if he had been doing his duty this matter would have been debated in the proper way by hon. members long ago. The hon. member mentioned the number of Hindus in British Columbia and he was careful to say that he had been "told" there were 1,200. Let me inform him that he has been told wrong; the number of Hindus that came into the country in the years prior to July 1st, 1920, was 5,297. I suppose some of them have gone since then to the country from whose bourne no traveller returns, but not many of them; and there is a long distance between 5,000 and 1,200. But that statement by the hon. member is quite as near the facts as most of his other logic on the subject.

Mr. JACOBS: Where did the hon. member obtain his figures?

Mr. NEILL: The statement from which I obtained them is headed "Nationalities of immigrants for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1920, and total immigration since July 1st, 1920." It begins with the British and goes through the list of other nationalities. It is a long statement and I will not weary the House by reading it. It was prepared by the librarian and the statistician of British Columbia.

Mr. JACOBS: Has the hon. gentleman the census figures from the department at Ottawa?

Mr. NEILL: I got these figures from the librarian and the statistician of British Columbia.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand the hon. gentleman to say that they were prepared by the librarian.

Mr. NEILL: And the statistician as well, I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not observe that the figures do not take account of emigrants, a great many of whom have gone South.

Mr. NEILL: We are told that if we do not pass the resolution or adhere to the principle suggested by the hon. member there will be a sore spot against Canada in the minds of the people of India. That point was dwelt upon very strongly on a previous occasion. Well, we shall not be alone in that respect, for the same precise conditions prevail, as regards India, in New Zealand, South Africa and Australia, and if you add Canada to the list what considerable portion of the British Empire is left for India to be sore at? She will have to be sore at the whole Empire and not against this one particular section of it.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. member pretend that Australia and New Zealand were not parties to the understanding that the Hindus should be given the franchise?

Mr. NEILL: I am not pretending anything. The subject is too serious for any pretence, and indeed no pretence is needed to bolster up my arguments; for what I say is true. In New Zealand the people of the Orient, including Hindus, are not allowed to vote, and if the hon. gentleman insists on corroboration I may say that I have the Australian act here from which I can quote if necessary. I do not want to detain the House however. It will be sufficient for me to observe that in Australia the Franchise Act says that no one born in Asia shall vote. I think that covers Indians. And as regards South Africa, the delegates from that part of the Empire hurried to put themselves right on this subject at the conference. They said, "We have no part nor lot with this principle and will not countenance it." They spoke right up and said they would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. JACOBS: That was the only Dominion that did protest and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. NEILL: They went further in their opposition, because as late as April 18th in a press cable from Capetown the Minister of the Interior in the government of South Africa is reported thus:

> He proposed to introduce a measure providing for residential and trading segregation next session.

[Mr. Neill.]

That was in reference to Indians and it does not look as though they propose to take the Hindus to their heart and bosom in the matter of the franchise or in any other way. That disposes of that portion of the British Empire.

Now my hon. friend drew a pitiful picture of the condition of these poor suffering people who are deprived of something which he represented as being almost as priceless to them as freedom itself, namely, the right to vote. Well, let us see what their condition was in the country from whence they came. The hon. member suggested that India was in the same position as Canada in regard to this matter. I am surprised that he should advance such a statement. Why, it is only since 1921, which is only two years ago—and all these Hindus came to this country long before that, when there was not even the faintest pretence at suffrage in India—that there was any form of popular legislature established in India. I have by me the year book, but I will not read from it. But there are 103 elected representatives in India at the present time in addition to a few nominated members; and as against 103 elected representatives there is a population in India of 247,000,000; so that on the basis of manhood suffrage each representative would have a constituency of 2,500,000. That is patently absurd, but it shows how much restricted is the franchise in India; and yet the hon. gentleman wants to give them the full advantage of our Canadian manhood suffrage. A constituency of 2,500,000! How I should like to be a member there. On the basis of our population and our unit of representation it would mean that one Hindu in 8,000 would vote in Canada, and if the hon. gentleman will whittle down to that proportion the representation which he would like to extend to these people in Canada I should not mind that fraction voting. But that is the proportion; it would be one in 8,000 of these downtrodden people who would have the right to vote in Canada if they were subjected here to the conditions that exist in India—conditions that did not come into being until long after they left their own country.

Mr. JACOBS: Surely the association with men like my hon. friend would be beneficial to these 1,200 Hindus in British Columbia?

Mr. NEILL: The 5,927 Hindus in British Columbia do not associate with me. Now if it were thought advisable in any part of the world to give these people the vote or to allow them to have a voice in their government it surely would be in India where they

have lived all their lives and where they would be conversant with all the conditions and all the peculiar troubles that concern them. But no; they are to be transplanted here to a country of which they are ignorant in the extreme. They know not our language nor do they know our customs; and what is more, they do not want to know them. Yet we are to bring them here and give them the franchise such as we and our women enjoy, although we deny to the aborigines of Canada, the native sons of the country, brought up and educated here, the very privilege which the hon. member is anxious to give to the same class of people born in some other country. An effort was made a year or two ago to give to the native Indians in this country the franchise in a limited degree but it proved a failure; but notwithstanding that denial to the aborigines of our own country the hon. member desires to give to the same class, so far as their position in the strata of society is concerned, people of the same standard of intelligence, the right to vote. He wants to give this right to people born in India, a heathen and many of them a debased class of people.

Mr. SHAW: Would my hon. friend deny entirely the franchise to these Hindu citizens, or would he be prepared to give them a limited franchise?

Mr. NEILL: So far as British Columbia is concerned I deny them that right absolutely, but I will suggest a scheme later on for partially meeting the hon. member's proposal. Now we are told we must give way in this matter to that good old stalking horse "Imperial reasons." I think I am as much an imperialist as the hon. gentleman opposite, and I recall that a few weeks ago I suggested that it would not besmirch our reputations as Canadians if we accepted a title of honour from the sovereign that reigns over us. I cannot recall that I got much sympathy from the hon. members in that respect, but that surely was an indication of my imperialism.

Mr. MARTELL: I hope I may be allowed to interrupt my hon. friend in order to explain my position on the question he has just introduced. Notwithstanding the vote of the majority of hon. members on this side, I did my utmost to see that honours should be accepted in this country so long as Canada formed a part of the British Empire. I only desire to make my position clear on this question.

Mr. NEILL: I am glad to find that there is one more intelligent man in the House.

Mr. JACOBS: May I tell my hon. friend that my imperialism and love of Empire is based on something that is sounder than mere ribbons or orders or decorations.

Mr. NEILL: I could not help thinking the other day, when we were passing the annuity to Dr. Banting and seeking in that way to do him honour, that that was one occasion on which perhaps it might have been well if Dr. Banting had been able to receive a title of honour from the sovereign and the people he has so well served. It is said that we are asked to lay on the altar of imperialism this right. Mr. Chairman, we are not asked to do so by imperialism at all; we are asked by Mr. Sastri and a few amiable faddists who follow him—that is all. Their audacity in asking is equalled only by their ignorance of what the granting of the request would mean. Amiable they are, I admit it; faddists they are—the class of people that send bouquets to the cell of the condemned prisoner. Faddists they are from beginning to end, not imperialists. But Mr. Sastri, with his beautiful and flowery language, captivates their shallow minds, and they are following him.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the hon. gentleman referring to the members who compose the Imperial Conference when he speaks about shallow minds?

Mr. NEILL: No, I am not. Did the hon. member think I was? Now, let us pause for a moment and see how the Imperial authorities regarded this question. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier says they promised —"promised" was the word he used a few minutes ago—the Hon. Mr. Sastri this concession; and in speaking to the Prime Minister he used the word "undertaking;" he said that an undertaking had been given by the leader of the Opposition. Now let us see what the Imperial authorities think. I suppose it will be admitted that the Hon. Winston Churchill

9 p.m.

—if that is his title—is an Imperialist; he was Secretary of State I think, or Secretary of the Colonies at the time. Here is the report of the conference that the member alludes to at which this question was brought up, and this is what Winston Churchill says—I will quote only two sentences:

> I think there is only one ideal that the British Empire can set before itself in this regard, and that is that there should be no barrier of race, colour, or creed which should prevent any man by merit from reaching any station if he is fitted for it.

Note that—"fitted for it." He then goes on to say:

But such a principle is to be very carefully and gradually applied, because intense local feelings are excited, and there is no doubt that extraordinary social stresses arise when populations are intimately mingled in some of these new countries and brought into severe economic competition.

Can we find in that anything that suggests a promise or undertaking? That is the very cautiously worded opinion, after hearing the full debate, of Hon. Mr. Churchill, and on that slim foundation the argument is based that we must give way, and we in Canada alone of all the British Empire. Why, Hon. Mr. Sastri himself is not so confident of success as my hon. friend opposite for we find him quoted in the press as saying that he is "not hopeful" of the franchise—and that in spite of the pledge or undertaking that my hon. friend reads into what is not there. I quote from the press:

With regard to the provincial and municipal franchise he is not so hopeful of immediate results.

It all comes down to a hope. Well, there are a lot of things we may hope for, but we do not look upon them as undertakings; we do not call them promises. That is the expression Mr. Sastri used when he returned from Canada—that he had hope.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. gentleman not see a difference between being hopeful of obtaining the franchise in a municipality in British Columbia and obtaining the franchise from the parliament of Canada? There is surely some difference.

Mr. NEILL: He also said he was doubtful about getting it in the Dominion. I am hopeful of going to Heaven some day, but there is no undertaking in that connection. The hon. gentleman tells us—and here I may be treading on dangerous ground, because he is a skilful lawyer—that the reason the Hindus do not now come to Canada is that they have to get a passport which is not obtainable from the Indian government. Well, I may be wrong in that regard, but my recollection of it is that they are not allowed to come to Canada unless they come by direct route. It is a quibble put in by this government to stop them from coming, because there is no direct steamship lines operating between India and Canada. Otherwise, they would be eligible to come in; but the order in council, I think, is worded in that way—they cannot come unless they come in a ship direct from the point of origin. That is a different reason from that given by my hon. friend. Now, he says there are only twelve hundred of these people who would be affected. We will say there are five thousand; according to my hon. friend's argument we would grant them the franchise and that would be the end of it. Well, that would not be the end of it. Five thousand voters in British Columbia would have a very powerful influence on the electorate and on the result of the election. They would be skilfully handled; they would vote in a mass and for one object, and the result would be to swing perhaps two or three seats. What would that object be? Would it be the advancement of Canada as a whole or of British Columbia as a province, or would it be to secure some advantage for that colony of Hindus? Would it not be the latter? Would it not be a case of those five thousand votes going to the candidate who would undertake to let these people bring in their women, their relations, or their friends? These votes would go solidly for the man who would do that or the party that would do that, and five thousand votes, especially in a provincial election, would cut an important figure. Moreover, the voters would soon cease to be only five thousand in number; they would increase very rapidly.

Another point is this: If you grant this privilege to the Hindus, can you deny it to others under similar conditions? The hon. member says there is a difference between these people; that the Hindus are British-born subjects and that differentiates them from Orientals such as Japanese and Chinese. But Japanese and Chinese are born in British Columbia, which is far more than the Hindu is. He too is a British subject, I admit; but when the oriental is born in British Columbia of naturalized parents how can we logically and with any sense of decency withhold the vote from him when he attains the age of twenty-one when we have given it to the Hindu, a worse fitted man, a man untrained, unaccustomed to our language? If we grant it to the Hindu how can we deny it to the oriental born in British Columbia who speaks the same tongue as we do? It follows as the night the day that if we grant it to Hindus we must grant it to the other orientals.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not a fact that a person born in any part of the British dominions, whether of British parentage or not, is regarded as a British subject? Japanese who are born in a British dominion are British subjects, whether their parents are naturalized or not.

Mr. NEILL: Certainly they are; I was not dealing with that aspect of it. I was saying that if we give the Hindus, who are British subjects, the vote, we should have to give it also to Japanese British subjects born in British Columbia. It is logical that we

should do so. Let me quote from what the Bishop of London said at a big meeting at London—I saw it in the paper only yesterday. He evidently had been over here, and this is what the report says:

> He had been preaching in London, immigration to Canada, but he found it very unpopular, for the following reason: There were, he said, 38,000 Chinese in British Columbia and 5,000 Japanese babies were born every year on the Pacific coast. He gave it as his opinion that unless Canada was populated to a larger degree by people from the British Isles, the white inhabitants would eventually become extinct in the Dominion.

That is an exaggerated statement, as we know, but it indicates the influence that these conditions have upon the point of view in England. You know, they think the world of bishops in the Old Country—much more than we do; and when a bishop gets up and says that British Columbia is swarming with orientals they are liable to take that as a piece of advice. We know that in the years to come, especially if we give these people the vote, there will not be a white British Columbia but a yellow British Columbia.

I would not for the world—in fact, the rules forbid me—reflect upon the hon. member's motives. But this resolution is what I might call a chart which guides his course to the goal he has in view. If you will look at the next resolution on the order paper following the one upon which he has based his remarks, you will find that it is also by him and it embodies a proposal that all the bars should be let down and that wholesale immigration into Canada should be permitted. I wonder if these two resolutions could have anything to do with each other? I wonder if the one is the doormat leading to the door of the other? I saw the other day in a medical journal that a new alkaloid had been discovered; I believe the name of it is scopolamin; I cannot pronounce it correctly. It has this peculiar quality that if it is administered in small doses it prevents, to put it in the medical sense, the inhibition of will, or to put it in plain language it compels a man to speak the truth without removing from him his ability to speak. I wonder if we applied a small dose of this to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier whether we would find that his motion was actuated by the imperialism of which he talks or with a desire to reach the next motion on the order paper and open the door to practically every kind of immigration. In case the hon. gentleman should be upset by my suggestion I would inform him that I would only prescribe for him a very small dose because I understand that if too strong a dose is given the effects are permanent, and I know he is a lawyer and might find that awkward.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the hon. gentleman tell me if he has any large quantity of that drug on hand and if he is able to spare a little of it?

Mr. NEILL: Just one word more and I am done. I said at the beginning that this was not the place to discuss the question, and it is not. It is not a Dominion matter. It is a British Columbia problem. Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Let us settle this problem in British Columbia. It has no more to do with the other provinces than if I were to interfere with some of the local customs and traditions of the province of Quebec. It is a British Columbia problem for this reason: the franchise invariably originates in the province. It is entirely a provincial matter. I would quote Sir Wilfrid Laurier who in 1917 laid down in most emphatic language in paragraph after paragraph that the true basis of our Dominion franchise under the British North America Act is the provincial franchise. He used the word "originates". The franchise originates in the province and then has to be translated into the Dominion act. The right hon. leader of the Opposition last year is on record in Hansard to substantially the same effect. He said that where prohibitions existed in the provincial franchise we carried them into the Dominion franchise, and if that is correct, and here we have two of the ablest men of our time on this subject, then the thing for us to do is to take this subject up in British Columbia and deal with it there, and the province of British Columbia would know how to deal with such a subject in the best interests of Canada as well as the best interests of the province. I would ask this House, therefore, not to force upon us in British Columbia a thing which is unconstitutional, and is against our customs and bitterly against our desires. There is no precedent for it whatever. Talk about creating a sore spot. Do this and you would create a canker in British Columbia that we as a nation would never recover from.

Let us go back to Quebec. I use that province as an illustration because it is the most united in its population and in its characteristics. If the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier is so enamoured of this proposition of which he has talked to us let him go to Quebec and get Quebec to pass a franchise law giving the Hindus and all kinds of orientals the right to vote there. Let him try that out for a while in the province of Quebec, and if these people value the franchise so

highly British Columbia will gladly send them down to Quebec. We will wish them God-speed and pay their fares. We will be delighted to see them go, and see how the hon. member will get on under those conditions. Is it not fair to use the hon. gentleman's own argument against himself? He wants to give them the franchise. Then let him give it them in his own province. Then such a wave of reform will spread from Quebec that perhaps we in British Columbia may follow his example—perhaps. But let him begin with Quebec. Let him ask the French race, those men who have maintained for scores of generations the purity of their race, of their language, and of their religion and traditions to give up all that and to take on the same plane of equality as themselves the lower strata of these orientals such as I have described, take them on the same level of political equality, take them on the same level of business equality, for the one follows the other, and take them on the same level of social equality for you cannot stop at business equality. Take them on the same plane of domestic equality, for you must go the whole length if you make a start. Ask the people of Quebec if they want to do that, and see what the answer is. I am sure they would repudiate the suggestion with scorn and indignation, and therefore I ask these Frenchmen, of whom our hon. Speaker is such an illustrious type, courtly sons of a courtly race, to give us in British Columbia only the same privilege that they would ask and demand for themselves. We ask no more and demand no less. We only ask that they shall treat us as they themselves would like to be treated, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that our representatives at this conference will go there with a determination to see that they preserve at that conference the right of British Columbia and of every other province to prescribe its own franchise, a right which I venture to suggest is the free right of a free people.

Mr. McBRIDE: It is not my intention to take up the time of the House for the ground has been fully covered by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. I say this though, that we in British Columbia want no more Hindus. Never did I value Canada and the laws of Canada more highly than when a boat-load of Hindus came from India to the port of Vancouver and was refused admittance to this country and sent back home by the previous government. I hope this government will maintain that stand. We have on the coast of British Columbia, Chinamen and Japs running our stores. They are running the white people out. We have the Greeks there running our hotels and we have the Jews running our second-hand stores, and now some people want to bring in the Hindus to run our mills. We have had enough of that in the past, and if this government wants to cast British Columbia adrift let her cast it adrift and let her cast it adrift before any more orientals come in. If they do, we white people out on the Pacific will prevent any more orientals coming to British Columbia.

Mr. JACOBS: It is not my purpose to answer the wild harangue of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. It would be impossible for me to do it. It does not require an answer. It is not susceptible of an answer. I notice that these gentlemen from British Columbia as soon as any subject is brought before the House see in it danger. They see in the Japanese, the Chinese and the Hindus something which they have reason to fear. So far as I know these people, they not only work but they seem to be the only men who do the work in that part of the country. But it is not for me here to criticize British Columbia. I am looking at this matter from the wider, from the national standpoint. I do not care what franchise the British Columbians have for their provincial legislature. That is a matter that does not concern me. But this is a matter which concerns the Dominion of Canada, and that is the reason why I raise it here in this House.

My hon. friend referred to the fact that I had had this resolution on the order paper for a considerable time and only brought it up in the last hours of the session. Well, he knows very well, and I need not tell him, I think he is a victim like myself of the fact that private members' day was taken away somewhat early in the session and consequently private members could not discuss the resolutions standing in their names on the order paper. There were all kinds of resolutions placed on the order paper, some of them by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member's resolution is dated February 21st.

Mr. JACOBS: It is dated February 23rd, and I did not have an opportunity of bringing it before the House before private members' day was taken away. I will admit as the hon. member has referred to it that I did not attend perhaps as assiduously as he did, and it is very possible that when the resolution was called I was not here to go on with it, but that ought not to be a reason for not

debating the matter when it can be legally brought before the House. The hon. member seems to make a point of the fact that some British Columbia members have left for their homes, and he insinuated that I had taken occasion to bring this matter up in the absence of these members, but I can assure the hon. member that he is a host in himself and it is not necessary for any British Columbia member other than himself to be here when the subject of oriental immigration or franchise is brought up. I want to put upon Hansard a despatch from Simla, India, which has appeared in the daily papers. It is dated June 26:

Indians would retaliate against the Dominions

Simla, India, June 26.—In connection with the problem relating to the status of Indians overseas, there is a growing demand here for retaliatory legislation imposing on subjects of the dominions and colonies similar disabilities to those imposed on Indian settlers in those countries. A leading democrat has given notice of a private permissive bill in the legislative assembly and three unofficial resolutions have also been laid on the table urging the government to legislate in the direction of reciprocity.

The adverse decision by the United States supreme court regarding the naturalization of Indians has strengthened the elements favoring retaliation.

Mr. NEILL: What is the date of that?

Mr. JACOBS: It was dated June 26, 1923. It is a despatch from Simla, India. May I also refer to an editorial which appeared in the Montreal Gazette of this week which is quite favourable to British Indians.

Fair play for British Indians

During last winter Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri, a member of the King's Privy Council, visited Canada for the purpose of impressing upon the government the right of British India subjects resident in Canada to exercise the franchise. The request was so reasonable that on every hand Mr. Sastri received sympathy.

Mr. NEILL: Is my hon. friend going to give the name of the writer of that article?

Mr. JACOBS: I can assure the hon. gentleman that I did not write it nor did I inspire it.

Mr. NEILL: The House would be interested in knowing the writer.

Mr. JACOBS: This is an editorial in the Montreal Gazette.

Mr. NEILL: I thought it was not customary to read extracts unless the writer's name was given?

Mr. JACOBS: Editorials from the Montreal Gazette have been read in this House. With some of them I agreed, with others I did not. This is one with which I agree.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps Sastri wrote it?

Mr. JACOBS: Let me continue:

Yet no action has been taken. The parliamentary session is now drawing to a close, and it may be too late to initiate new legislation despite the apothegm that it's never too late to mend. Yet it is disappointing that the government has not moved to the end of justice, regrettable from both Empire and Canadian standpoints. Chinese enjoy and exercise the franchise, but East Indians are deprived of the right. Why? Surely not because the latter are British subjects? The larger question of opening the door to admission to Canada of all races is not involved in this matter. What Mr. Sastri urged was the fairness of granting to Indians domiciled in Canada the same political rights as other classes of Canadians enjoy, and it is difficult to understand the delay of the government in granting the concession. There is more than moral right involved, and more than Empire interest. Canada does some trade with British India, and desires to extend the same, but if the East Indians conceive the notion that Canada is a country of prejudices, narrow views, and illiberality, it may easily happen that British Indians will turn from trade with it, and look askance at the pretence of Empire solidity. Antipathy to Canadian business agencies in India is already being cultivated. A straw serves to show how the wind blows. The Parsee Chamber of Commerce recently adopted a series of resolutions of which the preamble was as follows: "Whereas the treatment meted out to Indians in the colonies has been unsatisfactory and has continued to be so in an acute form notwithstanding the efforts of the Indian public and the government of India to get the situation altered, this Assembly now resolves that the government of India should henceforth, and until the matters complained of are fully remedied, adopt the principle of retaliation towards the nationals of the colonies."

The spirit of that resolution does not make for Empire unity, nor give hope of increasing connection commercially between Canada and India. It may be that the larger question of an open door to Indian immigration may be referred to the coming Imperial Conference, though that is debatable, but of this there is no room for doubt East Indians domiciled in Canada should be given the right of franchise on the same terms and conditions as are applied to other residents. That was the request of Mr. Sastri, and it ought to be complied with.

Mr. McBRIDE: If my hon. friend had a daughter would he want her to live and associate with the Hindu?

Mr. JACOBS: I would say this: I have three daughters, and I would rather see them associate with respectable Hindus than with some white men I know. But that is not the question which comes up here to-night. It is not a question of the association of white men with the duskier races or anything of the kind. The question—

Mr. McBRIDE: That is exactly what it is, Mr. Chairman. It is forcing these coloured races in among white people, and making the people of British Columbia associate with them.

Mr. JACOBS: Let me remind my hon. friend that the people of British Columbia are associating with them now.

Mr. McBRIDE: Yes, and it is not a credit to this country.

Mr. JACOBS: They are associating with them and would not associate with them any more if they had this right than they do now. The Hindus are there now and they are there to stay until, as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni says, they go to their reward. None of these people are now coming into the country. As I have already stated they are prohibited by the Indian government from leaving their own shores to come to Canada and the non-continuous journey clause of the order in council regarding immigration does not apply at all to those coming from India direct. That is an added restriction that has been put upon them. They can neither come now by non-continuous route, nor can they come direct. That is the point I wish to make. As I say, these people are there now. They are tax-payers. There is nothing against their receiving a franchise except the fear on the part of the people of British Columbia that when they do receive this franchise, as the member for Comox-Alberni said, when they elect a representative to parliament or to the legislature they might work some injury to the white people of that province. I trust this parliament will rise above these narrow considerations which have been mentioned by the member for Comox-Alberni and do its duty. I think it will be generally admitted that my hon. friend (Mr. Neill) is perhaps not the best person to speak on this matter without prejudice. He is one of the most prejudiced members in this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. JACOBS:—from British Columbia on the question—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. JACOBS:—of orientals. He positively glories in it. He says: "I am against orientals in every form; I am against their immigration, I am against their franchise." He has constituted himself the authority in matters of this kind; I think he would look upon it as a piece of flattery if I were to tell him publicly as I do now, that in the matter of oriental immigration and oriental franchise there is no more prejudiced person in the House than he is.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We perhaps are somewhat in the dark in entering upon a discussion such as this, because of not having placed before us any very definite agenda as to the subjects that are likely to come before either the Imperial or the Economic conference. A great deal will depend on the general intellectual background and attitude of our delegates there. When we had the discussion the other day on the Halibut treaty I am sure a great many of us must have been very much pleased indeed at the attitude of the Prime Minister with regard to the relationship which should exist between Canada and the Empire; and I feel very confident that if he can retain that position, in the midst of the surroundings in which he will find himself placed on the other side of the water, Canada will be comparatively safe.

It is, perhaps, rather fitting in a way and yet somewhat of an ill omen, that accompanying the Prime Minister there should be the Acting Minister of National Defence. Unfortunately, in the past imperialism and militarism have been very closely associated, but I trust that this appointment does not mean that the matters chiefly to be discussed are military in character.

Just in passing I have often wondered as we have sat here during these last months, as to how long it will be before the appointment of the Acting Minister of National Defence shall be endorsed by the people. It has seemed to me that it is of the very essence of our British institutions that a man should not become the head of an important government department without his appointment being definitely endorsed by the people.

I could think of no better development that could take place in international affairs than that we should have the whole question placed on some other than a military basis. Ideally, I have no doubt whatever that the appointment of the Minister of Justice is the best that could be made. From a practical standpoint, I wish the Minister of Justice were not so closely associated with the big financiers of this country. Some of us believe that the big financial interests ought not to dominate the Imperial or Economic Conferences. I wish that in some way it were possible that the great producing classes of this country, the farmers and the labouring people, could be represented on the Economic Conference. I do not propose to-night to discuss the legal and constitutional aspects of our relations to the Empire. These have been dealt with by our constitutional authorities and our legal friends. A great deal of stress has often been laid by them upon precedent. It seems to me the time has come when we shall have to make new precedents, when we shall have to view the situation as it actually is to-day, and act, having regard to the developments which have taken place in recent years. We all recognize that there are certain sentimental attachments—I do not use that word in a disparaging sense at all—

which unite Canada with the Motherland. We remember our common origin. We remember that we have a common language, that we have common traditions and common institutions. These things, after all, are the most fundamental in maintaining the ties that unite this country with other countries composing the British Commonwealth of nations. But I should like to emphasize that loyalty does not in any way mean subserviency. Too often we have people on the floor of this House and elsewhere throughout the country deprecating any criticisms of policies which are regarded as British, or which are named British. Rather it would appear that in the effort to decide our own policies according to our best lights, we are preeminently British in spirit. Some people have still the colonial mind. They think of themselves as inferiors. They have what I suppose the psycho-analysts would call inferiority complex. I cannot conceive that we can take our real place in the British Empire until we outgrow that and remember that we in Canada are just as fit to discuss the affairs of the Empire as are the people in any other part of the Empire.

I should like to endorse a great deal of what has been said by the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). It seems to me he has placed the whole situation on a proper basis. I cannot but deprecate the attitude taken by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) with regard to the orientals. He has tried to disparage almost every other nationality than our own, the Chinese, the Japanese and the Greeks and the Jews. No, I think it was the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) who enumerated these particular groups. I cannot see that we are going to get very far by a narrow bigotry of that kind. The member for Comox-Alberni, in referring to the fact that the orientals have no vote, said he was afraid that if the Indians should be given a vote it would result in a vote being given to other orientals. I should like to ask why not? I admit that I do not believe in admitting large numbers of these people at the present time because we are not in a fit position to take care of them. I do not believe we can have an intermingling of these races under existing conditions, but it is one thing to say to the orientals "it is not well for you to come in at the present time," and it is quite another thing after we have allowed them to come in and they are citizens with us, rate-payers with us and all the rest of it, to deny them the fundamental rights of citizenship. Last summer when I was walking through Stanley Park I could not but think of the member for Comox-Alberni. At one spot I stood before a beautiful monument erected to the memory of the Japanese soldiers who had fallen during the great war in the cause of what we were told was British liberty. I cannot quite see just where is the British justice in accepting the sacrifice which these people made for the British Empire and then refusing them the common rights of citizenship. The member for Comox-Alberni spoke of the Indian people as a heathen and debased class. Any one who has had the most elementary knowledge of the great philosophies of India must realize how far the member is from at all correctly representing the situation. Even out in British Columbia several years ago, when I visited the Sikh temple in Vancouver, where several hundred Indians were met, and heard one educated Indian speaking to his fellow countrymen, and holding before them the very highest ideals, I could not help but realize our narrowness. I believe that, in dealing with these matters, difficult as they are—and I know they are difficult—we should rise above narrow prejudice and look at them from a little bit more of a world point of view.

There are several principles that have occured to me, to which I would like to refer very briefly, which it would seem to me we ought to adhere to at this Imperial Conference; the first, clear understanding that from this time on Canada must be essentially autonomous. We need not worry as to our exact relationship to the other parts of the Empire. I suppose in time some arrangement will develop, through a series of conferences or something of that kind, which will enable us to keep in touch with other parts of the world, but the biggest thing we can emphasize is our own autonomy. I do not know that the position of labour on this point has ever been closely defined, but I would say that, on the whole, labour in this country echoes the thought of labour in the Old Country, and hence I should like to read a paragraph or two of the famous draft programme of the British labour party, as published several years ago.

Mr. McBRIDE: Let us hear from British Columbia.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There are other parts of the world than British Columbia. The paragraph I refer to reads:

> We desire to maintain the most intimate relations with the labor party overseas. Like them, we have no sympathy with the projects of "Imperial Federa-

tion," in so far as these imply the subjection to a common imperial legislature wielding coercive power (including dangerous facilities for coercive imperial taxation and for enforced military service), either of the existing self-governing dominions, whose autonomy would be thereby invaded; or of the United Kingdom, whose freedom of democratic self-development would be thereby hampered; or if India and the colonial dependencies, which would thereby run the risk of being further exploited for the benefit of a "White Empire." We do not intend, by any such "Imperial Senate," either to bring the plutocracy of Canada and South Africa to the aid of the British aristocracy, or to enable the landlords and financiers of the Mother Country to unite in controlling the growing popular democracies overseas. The autonomy of each self-governing part of the Empire must be intact.

And again, in speaking of international relationships:

And we carry the idea further. As regards our relations to foreign countries, we disavow and disclaim any desire or intention to dispossess or to impoverish any other state or nation. We seek no increase of territory. We disclaim all idea of "economic war." We ourselves object to all protective customs tariffs; but we hold that each nation must be left free to do what it thinks best for its own economic development, without thought of injuring others. We believe that nations are in no way damaged by each other's prosperity or commercial progress; but, on the contrary, that they are actually themselves mutually enriched thereby. We would therefore put an end to the old entanglements and justifications of secret diplomacy and the formation of leagues against leagues.

I would not urge a narrow nationalism in this regard. There are some who have even on the floor of this House suggested that we should cut ourselves almost entirely free from either the Motherland or international councils. The world has developed past that stage. There is such a close interrelation between its different parts to-day, such an essential unity, that no one nation can any longer live to itself. Canada cannot possibly turn the clock backward. Canada canot possibly play the role of an independent nation. We must meet with the other nations throughout the world; but let us meet with them recognizing that we are full grown and free to co-operate with them in all that will make for the common welfare.

We have been very frequently told that we in this country have nothing to do but to endorse what has been called British policy. I should like to pause for a moment to ask: What is British policy? Surely we do not have to read history very closely to recognize that British policy is as changeable as the policy of any other country; that it changes with each successive government; that it changes from year to year. I suppose we might talk about Canada's National policy. That, perhaps, is the most stable thing that I know anything about, because the Liberal party may come or the Conservative party

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

may come, but there is little difference—we have the self-same protective policy as we have had it for many years. At the same time we remember that there are considerable changes of policy from year to year. We cannot speak definitely of a British policy. It was the British policy a few months ago to bring Great Britain to the verge of another great war. A few months later the particular group that advocated that policy was discredited, and we had a new British policy. So I would suggest that the policy called the British policy, to which we have often been asked to subscribe, has been a policy simply of a little group of militarists and imperialists. I would venture to suggest to the Prime Minister and others who go in this delegation, that possibly they would be a great deal more nearly in line with the fundamental sympathies and ideals of the Canadian people if they followed not so much the representations of some of the old-time diplomats of Great Britain, as the representations of the more humble people represented by the British Labour party.

With regard to our international relations, there are several points, I think, that ought to be held before us clearly at this time. I should like to quote a few paragraphs from a recent debate in the British House of Commons and to put forward the positions taken on the floor of that House as fairly representing the positions taken by many of us in this country. On May 10, in the House of Commons, Sir John Simon raised the question of a certain decree issued by the commission which is governing the Saar, or rather misgoverning it under the League of Nations. Mr. Asquith supported Sir John Simon. Lord Robert Cecil broadened out the debate and raised the general problem of Franco-German relations. In the course of that debate Mr. E. D. Morel gave utterance to some sentiments which I should like to place before this House. He said:

The real issue in this matter is not reparations. It never has been reparations. It is not security. It never has been security. The real issue in this matter is whether or not the present rulers of France are going to succeed in their fixed determined aim of disrupting Germany. That is the real issue. It is an issue of very great importance not only to France and Germany, but to the whole of the continent of Europe and to ourselves. All these discussions about reparations and security are really completely artificial when you are faced with a situation such as you are facing to-day—when a French army is paralysing the heart and lungs of industrial Germany, when the Saar valley is being virtually annexed to France under the cloak of the League of Nations, when the whole of the civil administration of the Rhineland is being ruthlessly stamped out and the whole country is being gallicized. Deportations to-day amount

to over 23,400 persons, including 33 editors, 5 Roman Catholic priests, 10 Protestant clergymen, and 150 teachers. This, I repeat, is the real issue—whether France is going to succeed in disrupting Germany. This country can no longer afford to ignore the real issue. The interest of our working classes, the interests of our commercial classes, and our national security are being more and more affected, and French policy is threatening more and more the peace, the immediate peace, of the world. . . . .

What is the truth? Put bluntly—and I shall make no reference whatever to French armaments as to which a great deal has recently been disclosed—the truth is this: The French General Staff is organizing the new Europe for war.

And he goes on to give in some detail the conditions which warrant him in making that statement. With regard to the Saar valley, Mr. Charles Buxton stated:

Here is a great miltary occupation going on, not by the League of Nations at all, not under the Treaty at all, because the Treaty says that you have to have a force formed of the population of the Saar itself. There is nothing of the kind. The French troops began, I think, speaking from recollection, at 2,000 or 3,000. They rose to 4,000, and have now risen to 10,000 men, for a wretchedly small district as regards size, and for a population, as I have said, of considerably under 1,000,000. Moreover, as I am reminded, they have their wives and families with them quartered on the country.

With regard to the Ruhr he said:

The hon. member for Thanet (Mr. Harmsworth) has said something about the smooth and easy working of this occupation of the Ruhr.

Mr. McBRIDE: I would like to know what bearing this has on the Hindu question.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is hardly necessary to remind the House, although it might be necessary to remind the hon. member, that the Hindu question is not the only question that has to be discussed at the Imperial Conference.

He has ignored the fact that there prevails a reign of terror among the workers. He did not even pay any regard to the fact that a very large number of them have been shot down. The number amounts, if I have added up the figures rightly, to 52 who have already been killed, the majority of them working men, generally on the way to or from their work, suspected for aught I know of some evil intention or other, but in many cases with no overt act proved against them whatsoever, but simply shot as they were going about in the ordinary course of their business.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: From what paper is my hon. friend quoting?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: From the Official Debates of the British House of Commons. With regard to the Russian situation, too, I desire to give another brief quotation as to the attitude taken by those whom we labour people in this country regard as essentially representing our position in the Old Land. Mr. Ponsonby said:

The bottom of the trouble is our refusal to recognize The Russian government. The question of recognition is one of very great importance. Recognition of a government does not depend on its quality or its methods but purely and solely on its stability. That is the only point that ought to be taken into account in recognizing the sovereignty of another nation. I would refer the hon. gentleman in charge of the vote to the books on international law, and he will find there is no instance in history of so long a period elapsing in which a government—which has shown stability from the fact that after five and a-half years it is more firmly established—has been denied recognition in the way we have denied it.

Mr. MORIN: Who made the speech in the British House of Commons from which the hon. gentleman has quoted?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The first quotation was from Mr. Morel, the second from Mr. Charles Buxton, and the third from Mr. Ponsonby.

Mr. MORIN: I thought you mentioned Lord Robert Cecil and Sir John Simon.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I mentioned them as taking part previously in the debate, but the quotations I gave were from those whom I have just mentioned. Without going at all into the details of these great questions which are before Great Britain and Europe I would suggest that the representatives of this country urge upon the Imperial Conference the necessity for a modification of the Peace Treaty of Versailles, looking towards getting a little bit nearer the terms of the Armistice. I shall not weary the House to-night by quoting from that standard book of Mr. John M. Keyne's, in which he shows the iniquity of the Peace treaty and how far it is from the terms under which our enemy laid down his arms. I would refer anyone seeking information to that book by an expert.

Mr. LAFLAMME: We have all read it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am sure it is sufficient to convince anyone who has read it.

Mr. LAFLAMME: Did the hon. member read Tardieu's answer to that book?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have read a number of them but not that one.

Mr. LAFLAMME: You have a one-sided view of the situation if you have not read it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would also urge upon our representatives that they insist upon the fixing of reparations in some form that will allow for the reconstruction of Europe and the bringing about of those stable conditions on which alone permanent peace depends. With regard to the League of Nations, I would point out, as I did in a previous discussion, the importance of making the league inclusive and democratic in its character.

The whole world has looked forward to some sort of institution, some super-national assembly, that would be a meeting place for the various nations for the interchange of opinions, where relations could be explained in order better to be understood, and where in some way discussion would be substituted for war as the arbiter in every dispute. I cannot see how this can be accomplished so long as any nation is excluded from what purports to be a league of the nations of the world; nor do I think it can be brought about until such a league has become more democratic than the existing one. It should be clearly recognized that the old policy of regarding armaments as a guarantee of peace has absolutely failed; and instead of fortifying Singapore, as I believe is being done at the present time, with the consent of, if not under pressure from some of the other dominions—instead of going still further on the road towards the preparation for war by air, we should recognize frankly that war has been a failure so far as the establishment of international peace is concerned. If these principles could be successfully maintained at the conference and some progress made in the direction of having them implemented the conference would serve an eminently useful purpose. Undoubtedly at the present time there is need for a better understanding between the various peoples of the world. But that is not sufficient. As the editor of a farm paper wrote me only a few days ago, until definite economic reforms are achieved war is inevitable; so long as the condtions making for war remain there can be no escape from it. I would urge upon men who have the great responsibility of representing Canada that they carry these ideals with them across the waters. We know that when President Wilson crossed to the great conference in France he carried with him the ideals of the majority of the people of America, and I think of a very great many other countries. Unfortunately, owing to a series of circumstances, he seemed to have been unable to impress his ideals upon that conference so that we find the treaty altogether different from any instrument which would really express those ideals. The result has been the disturbed condition that has existed in Europe since that time. I should like our representatives in going overseas to carry with them some of the ideals that are so common among the ordinary people of this country. We are longing for peace and for economic justice. We are a people whose forefathers came to this country prepared to work hard in the hope that they might be able to found homes for themselves and their children. We are a people who in the pioneer days knew a great deal of neighbourliness. We are not anxious to interfere with other people's affairs; we are anxious to live and let live; and if we can only carry out these homely virtues in international relationships then the coming conference will be of value not merely to us, but as well to the world at large.

Mr. FORKE: I would call the attention of the committee to the conditions that existed in pre-war days. Europe at that time was an armed camp. Large nations were arming one against the other, and the only epoch in history to which that time can be fittingly compared was the Napoleonic era. But conditions have changed considerably since then. A conference was called in 1909 when the different communities comprising the British commonwealth assembled to discuss some very important questions. I believe that Australia undertook at that time to establish the nucleus of an Australian navy, while Canada undertook some naval contributions and New Zealand gave a promise of cash. Then came the war and all the concomitant conditions of war, and we find to-day an entirely different world from that which we knew before 1914. The great nation of Germany has almost, if not entirely, disappeared from the face of Europe as a military power and Russia is practically beyond the pale of international co-operation. In fact in Europe to-day we have about twenty-five nations in a more or less disorganized condition, each of them trying to maintain an army, all of them, perhaps, weak economically and in almost every other way. It seems to me to be one of the tragedies of the time that instead of getting together to hasten the day of peace and goodwill, the countries of Europe to-day are engendering quite a different feeling by hostile armies and hostile tariffs. They are building around themselves; they are shutting each other out; they imagine they are going to bring about prosperity in their own respective countries by having no communication with their neighbours. What is the world's greatest need at this time? I think it can be best expressed by the word that Bonar Law used when he came into power—"tranquillity." What the world needs is tranquillity, stability, in order that men may devote themselves to the work of rebuilding, to the work of bringing back a condition of contentment and prosperity.

I would like to say just a word here in connection with the position that the United

States occupies. We all realize the great power and influence that the United States of America can have for good or for evil in the world. The United States occupies a position that has never been occupied by any other country. We speak of the United States as a nation; in reality it is a galaxy of nations, almost self-contained. They could almost build a fence around themselves and be complete in themselves. I know they require certain commodities that are necessary to civilization; yet the United States more than any other country can stand upon its own feet, can carry on almost without entering into communication with other lands. I do not believe, however, that anything like that is ever going to happen. I know there is a movement in the United States the purpose of which is to have that country live unto itself, to look only to its own welfare and its own prosperity. But it is only a passing phase; it will soon disappear and the United States will come back to the great position she should occupy in the world's affairs. Now, what is the view that the United States takes of the British Empire? I know we always speak of ourselves as a community of nations, each of which is complete in itself. Yet I venture to make the assertion to-day that outside of the politicians and the diplomats
10 p.m. in the United States, the general impression there is that Canada is little more than a colony of Great Britain. The great masses of the people of the United States do not, I believe, understand the position that Canada and the other nations occupy in the British Empire. The war has changed the whole aspect of our national life. I think I am correct in saying that during the war the supreme executive was composed of the British cabinet and the prime ministers of the different dominions. Canada during the war, through her sacrifice and the price she paid in that conflict, reached what may be called the status of nationhood; we realize that from the part she took in the framing of the Peace Treaty and the formation of the League of Nations. Conditions have entirely changed, and at the coming conference many important questions will have to be discussed and at least partly settled. Lloyd George's famous telegram with regard to the Chanak affair brought us very quickly to our senses and made us realize that some day we shall be forced to come to a rapid decision bearing upon the question just what position we occupy in the British Empire. I think the sentiment that was expressed in a great many quarters by a large number of the people of this Dominion in that connection was that no action should be taken by the government of Canada without the consent of parliament. But that has not been settled; nothing is definite. These questions all remain to be settled in the future and I hope that when the decision is taken they will be settled rightly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman repeat that? What question is it that is not settled?

Mr. FORKE: I was speaking about that famous telegram that came from England during the Chanak affair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Chanak affair?

Mr. FORKE: The Near Eastern question. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was just asking what question it was that had not been settled.

Mr. FORKE: That is the question that is not settled: What position was Canada going to take when the requisition came from Great Britain? Or should war arise and assistance be sought from Canada and the other nations of the Empire, what position should we take? That is the question that is not settled. Does my right hon. friend understand my point?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not. I do not know any question that is not settled.

Mr. FORKE: I imagine that a great many questions have not been settled. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition has settled the exact position of Canada in the Empire I hope we will get the benefit of his views when he speaks on this question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the hon. gentleman said there was some question as to who decided what we would do in case of requisition. I do not know of any requisition. I certainly do not know of any question as to who decides.

Mr. FORKE: Perhaps we will leave the question, because the right hon. gentleman does not understand me, and I do not understand him; we will call it quits.

India has been mentioned several times to-night. In discussing these questions we can hardly take India into consideration. India occupies a different position from that of any of the other nations making up the British commonwealth. We speak about India as a country; in reality India comprises many countries. There are eleven distinct languages in India, to say nothing of a great variety of dialects, and I suppose for the time being at least we shall have to leave India out of

consideration. I wish only to dwell for a few moments on certain conditions affecting the position occupied by the British commonwealth as a whole.

We are all a little disappointed, perhaps, at the extent of the influence the League of Nations has had upon the world's history during the last few years. I believe that in that same league is the germ of something that will in the years to come be of inestimable benefit to the civilized world. I like to think of the British commonwealth, or of the British Empire if you will—because it does not make any difference what phrase you use to express the same meaning—I do like to think of the British Empire as being in itself a League of Nations, a beginning of that wider and better league that we hope some day will embrace the whole civilized world. I only hope the day is not far distant when the United States will enter the League and thereby lend its great influence to the cause of promoting the peace and welfare of humanity.

As to what will take place at the conference, let me say a word. While retaining our own individuality as a nation, working out our own salvation, I wish to see no slacking of the ties that bind us in that Empire, the ties of sentiment and loyalty to the British Crown. I believe, however, that any attempt to bind the ties more tightly by any agreement will perhaps have the worst effect possible—will, in fact, have results that are not anticipated. I believe that nothing can bind us with stronger chains than those feelings of loyalty and those ties of sentiment that are the strongest feelings within the human breast, and I would warn those delegates who go over to represent Canada at that conference to be very, very careful in entering into any agreement that will be binding or constitute a legal tie of any kind that might be irksome because I do believe that there is no question of the loyalty of this country to the British Empire or of our remaining an integral part of that great Empire. The world to-day is in need of a partnership of nations. That is its greatest need, to live down the feelings of hatred and envy that are so rampant everywhere. If we need a commonwealth of nations I come back to where I began and say, shall we do anything that will lessen the ties that bind the nations of the British commonwealth into one? I say no. By every means in our power let us strengthen those ties by those feelings of affection and loyalty that I have already mentioned.

What of the future? There has been some little misunderstanding about what I have said to-night as to our future not being settled. Our future is not settled. Our position is not settled. We claim that we are a nation, that we are, as was quoted the other night, "daughter in our mother's house but mistress in our own." That is a very good phrase and perhaps it explains our position. But, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many things to be taken into consideration. A great many difficult problems will have to be solved, and I would only hold out this idea to those who go over to Great Britain to represent Canada, and that is to be careful, to go slow, to make no rash promises. I know the temptations will be great. I have read something about those conferences that were held during Chamberlain's time, when every influence was brought to bear to tie up the daughter nations a little more firmly than they were at that time. But it came to naught and I believe that any such attempts along the same lines at the present time will work nothing but evil. I have faith in the loyalty of the people of this country. I have faith that they will do the right thing when the occasion arises, that they will be loyal. Should the Mother Country be ever in necessity I know that this country will be ready to rise to the occasion. But there is danger in making an attempt to fix hard and fast lines. I believe the safe thing, to quote again, would be "to go on from precedent to precedent" until finally the stage has been reached when we shall know exactly what our destiny is to be.

I shall not take up any more time. I have not uttered anything I know that will help those who go over to represent us other than this, that they should be very careful in making any binding promises that may be irksome, and which would perhaps do more than any thing else to disintegrate this Empire that is founded upon feelings of affection and reverence and love for the Mother Country.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have no intention to broach the subject of the Hindus and Japanese or of any other people in the world. I rather wish to speak in behalf of the Canadian people. You are not without knowing, sir, what have been my views in the past and what they are to-day.

In the last war, the Great War as it is known, I was in favour of participating within the limit of our means. I was, however, against taking part to the extent of bringing ruin upon us, as we did. That is why I rise this evening to again warn, inasmuch as my humble voice can he heard, the right hon.

Prime Minister and his colleagues who will soon cross the Atlantic to confer with the statesmen of England. My sympathy accompanies them, for British diplomats have a way of outwitting all others. Therefore, let us pray God that our own statesmen may hold their own.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) sailed across the seas in 1921. He took part in an Imperial Conference. A report of this conference was tabled in the House; however, before laying down reports of that nature, it seems that great care is taken to withhold anything that one does not wish the Canadian people to know. I might ask the right hon. leader of the Opposition if he understands what I am saying. If not, let him say so, and I shall repeat it in English. I might ask him if it is not a fact that we never have an exact report of the Imperial Conferences? I wish to know what took place; not only for myself, but for the electors whom I represent in this House, the whole country wants to know whether he has pledged himself to build naval stations here and there with a view to participating in future wars of the Empire?

For my part, sir, I shall not oppose those who wish to go and fight for the British Empire, so long as they do so at the expense of that Empire that they follow the example of the Frenchmen who were in our country when war broke out, and fought for their flag but always at the expense of the French government. I, myself, wish to uphold the British flag, but I want to do so within the limit of our means and no more; for one must not go beyond such means.

I do not think that the present Prime Minister, in whom I have faith, is the greatest advocate of imperialism in this House; on the contrary, I believe he has somewhat of my ideas on the subject, for I have read a little the biography of the Prime Minister's grandfather and I am led to believe that he is not an Imperialist but has at heart the interest of the Canadian people.

When I listen, very attentively indeed, to the right hon. leader of the Opposition who always shows ability as a debater, besides being very entertaining, when I witness his attacks against the government in regard to moneys voted here and there on wharves amounting to very little, when I note that he has become close, I might say like a Jew, I then ask myself how a man like him can still think of going to England to pledge Canada to the extent of hundreds of millions even billions of dollars. I cannot understand my right hon. friend's actions, at present, because we, the citizens of Quebec, those bad people to his mind, know fully well that he is one of those who ruined our country. Every one admits it. The ex-Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, as well as the late Prime Minister, the present right hon. leader of the Opposition, declared time after time that they would sacrifice our last man and last dollar to win the war. Just as if we had been left alone to win the war! But, Mr. Chairman, I have often stated and I do so again, we were not alone in this war; there must have been people in the British Isles, in the other colonies, in Belgium and in Italy. We were three against one German, at the beginning of the war. There must have been some people who did not take seriously to the war. I have reason to believe that the colonies were wiser than the remainder of the British Empire, at the outbreak of the war. However, let us change the subject.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, as I previously stated a few moments ago, does not want any wharves; he says we are spending too much; in fact, I admit it. However, last year, he told us that we were spending only 17 cents per capita for the navy and that we should be ashamed to spend so little for such an object. I put the question to the right hon. leader of the Opposition: Why this navy? With whom shall we go to war to-morrow? With our neighbours, the Americans? We do not need to make preparations to fight them, we are beaten in advance; they are 12 to 1. Now, if in the near future, war breaks out in Europe, and that England is still more interested than we are in these wars, I wish to tell the right hon. leader of the Opposition, For heaven's sake, let England first fight; and if she cannot do so alone, let her call upon our men and let her pay them to fight. At the present moment, England is paying off part of her debts while we are accumulating deficit after deficit, from year to year. Would it then be fair that we should take part again in European wars? I say no.

Why all these trips to the Imperial Conferences, if it is not to trap the Prime Ministers of the self-governing colonies, to make them take on responsibilities towards the Empire, like when the question of the Near East cropped up, when the late Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Meighen) wanted us to immediately declare ourselves in favour of participating in the mix-up. The right hon. leader of the Opposition seems to think that the moment Canada will enter a war, the enemies will say: We will fight no more, because these Canadians wipe out everybody and we are

afraid of them. If that is his opinion, such is not mine.

Does England need a navy? She certainly does need a navy to protect her trade over the whole world. Her existence is dependent on that trade! That is why she fought against Germany, for she feared Germany might displace her in the world's trade. England needs her merchant marine and her navy is absolutely indispensable to protect the former; but that is her business and I do not see what we have to do with it. Let us not disturb our mother-in-law, England, and let us go about our own business in this country. That is all I ask. During the last general election, in 1921, I proclaimed before the people of the county I represent, that I had not, so to speak, any recognized leader and I state in this House, in the presence of the leader I recognize to-day, that if I were again candidate in my county, and should the Prime Minister be in favour of taking part in the Imperial defence, either by a contribution in money or by the building of a Canadian navy in peace time, but for the defence of the Empire in war time, I declare now that I would not be that Prime Minister's candidate and that he would hear from me, should he blunder to that extent. I wish to always be consistent with my past and faithfully represent the electors that have sent me to parliament.

Mr. JACOBS: Inasmuch as the right hon. leader of the Opposition was a delegate to the conference of 1921, and took part in the deliberations with respect to the Hindu franchise, would it be unreasonable to ask him to let us have the benefit of his views on this important question. If the discussion were to close without any expression of opinion from him it would be like playing Hamlet without the melancholy Dane.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not aware that I still was Hamlet. I observed when the hon. member spoke first that he asked that the Prime Minister state what his position was, that he already knew mine. He repeated his appeal two or three times, but I do not see that it has been very successful. Since that I notice he has been down sitting with the Prime Minister. Now he has decided to ask me to state my position. I will answer him in one word: I stand just where I did, and my words are fully on record in the conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend one question. The resolution of the conference, or at least one clause of it is as follows:

[Mr. Lanctot.]

The conference accordingly is of the opinion that in the interests of the solidarity of the British commonwealth, it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized.

The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) has said that these words imply an undertaking on the part of this parliament, or rather on the part of Canada, to see that the federal franchise is granted to the Indians in British Columbia. Is that correct or not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The words are English and the words are simple. I understand them fully, and if the Prime Minister does not I will have to leave him just where he is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the House is entitled to an answer from my right hon. friend. He represented this country at the Imperial conference. He knows better than anyone else what interpretation he placed on these words. I ask him, seeing he represented Canada at the Imperial conference when that resolution was passed, whether he understood that Canada was at that time giving an undertaking to the Indians in British Columbia to the effect that they would be entitled to the franchise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No human being understood anything of the sort. The words are very plain and there is no misunderstanding them. The right hon. gentleman is now Prime Minister and he had better take his responsibility.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am ready to take mine. I wanted to find out where my hon. friend stands.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I do not wish to prolong this discussion in any way. I wish to say, however, that I associate myself with the remarks made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), particularly as one of the representatives of the province whose population is largely composed of industrial workers. These workers are fully in accord with the views that have been expressed by my colleague from British Columbia to-night.

I should like to refer for a moment or two to one or two remarks made by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). That hon. gentleman stated that the representatives from British Columbia are opposed to oriental or Hindu immigration, or words to that effect. I should like to assure the House that the members from British Columbia are a unit on this question with which they have been identified to a greater degree than the members from any other province. You will understand, Mr.

Chairman, that the climatic conditions in British Columbia are such as to appeal to immigrants from the Orient. In the eastern provinces the climate is such that it is hardly likely to attract any very great number of the immigrants, and therefore those provinces will not be troubled with the problem that confronts us on the Pacific coast. Some few years ago a test case was made in British Columbia in regard to the admission of Hindus into Canada. The stand then taken by the people of the province was not based on any narrow ground. They did not look upon the question from the point of view that it was going to interfere with the industrial workers of the province, or with industrial activities carried on there. The stand they took was with the desire to reserve the province for the people for whom it was meant. The position that the people of British Columbia took at that time was very sound, and they have carried out that position from year to year. Some few years ago certain regulations were made which restricted the immigration of Hindus to this country, and if it were not for those regulations we would have in British Columbia, not 1,200 or 1,500, not 5,000, but we would have at least 500,000 or 1,000,000 Hindus. That, in a few words, is practically the situation, that is why the people of that province have taken this firm stand, and that is why the members from British Columbia are a unit on this question. At the present time there are only some few hundred, perhaps anywhere around 1,500 or 2,000 Hindus there. But the people of that province have expressed themselves very forcibly in regard to extending the franchise to these Hindus in reference to provincial and federal questions, and it is our belief that that expression of opinion should still be maintained. It is only through necessity that we have adopted that opinion and taken that firm stand in the past, and that we wish to maintain that attitude on it in the future. I can only add my few remarks to those expressed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) in saying that we can only urge the Prime Minister to keep in view the sentiment of the province of British Columbia and the position that we have taken in the past. We respectfully urge that at the coming conference the Prime Minister give every consideration to the views of the people as they have been expressed in British Columbia, and to the views that have been expressed in this House by members representing that province, particularly upon the oriental and Hindu question. I might also add that the people of British Columbia do not take any second place with the other provinces in respect to their loyalty or the broadness of their views.

Mr. GOOD: When I rose before I was under the impression that we were discussing item 563. I perceive, however, that we are discussing the Imperial Conference vote, and I shall confine my remarks at the present moment to that question, and reserve what I had in mind before for the subsequent vote on the Economic Conference.

I think the question under consideration is one of the most important that we can possibly give attention to. I am reminded of a statement which H. G. Wells makes in, I think, the concluding chapter of his Outline of History where he says that modern civilization faces three great classes of problems; those pertaining to property, those pertaining to currency, and those pertaining to international relations; and if any one will read his war novel Mr. Britling Sees it Through, I think he cannot help being convinced, if he had not been convinced before by his own observations, of the intimate relations that exist between what we might call foreign policy or international relations and the life and welfare of the individual. It seems to me that our citizens do not generally attach sufficient importance to the question of foreign relations. Sometimes I think of a little group of what we have called German junkers, sitting down prior to the great catastrophe, and, like a couple of men playing chess, figuring out how they were going to play the game of war. Little did they think at that time of the awful misery, bloodshed and loss that was to follow. Little did the people of the world think that those few men could plunge the whole world into such chaos. However, Mr. Chairman, unless the rank and file of the people of the world wake up, and take an interest in questions of this sort, at any time we may be plunged into the same sort of disaster. Our children may be slain, our fields devastated, and our cities razed to the ground. Therefore, I think it is of extreme importance that at this Imperial Conference, where the issues of war and peace and other matters of great importance will be under consideration, our delegation should keep in mind, not the playing of the game, not the old kind of diplomancy, but the interests and welfare of the rank and file of the masses of the people. I suppose most of the hon. members present, some at least, will have read that eloquent passage in Carlyle's Sartor Resartus, where he speaks of the twenty Britishers going

to meet the twenty Frenchmen, who had no quarrel with them, and each blowing out the brains of the other. This awful tragedy is something that statesmen will have to grapple with, that those who elect statesmen to office will also have to grapple with.

In regard to this matter, which no doubt will be considered at the conference, I would like to endorse what the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has already said in that connection. The condition in Europe at the present time is an object lesson to us, and we ourselves have suffered, and are suffering at the present time, from that condition. We are suffering directly and indirectly. Our farmers are suffering at the present time from dislocation of trade, from the loss of Europe as a purchaser of our commodities and I hope that the most serious consideration will be given at the approaching conference to some amendments of the Treaty of Versailles which would look towards the restoration of normal conditions in Europe.

In regard to questions which we might call domestic, I want to suggest to the Prime Minister and to the House one very definite matter which might possibly be taken up, and which I think ought to be taken up at the Imperial Conference, and that is the question of the right to amend our own constitution. I do think that this is a matter of prime importance. I was going to say it is a disgrace, but at all events, it is an anacronism, and an anomoly that Canada should not have the right to amend her own constitution, and if there were any way of submitting the matter to the House to be voted on, I would be only too glad to test the feeling of the House in regard thereto. I know these things have to develop gradually; but I submit in all earnestness that our delegation should take up with the British government, this question of obtaining the right to amend our constitution. I wonder whether some resolution could not be drafted in that direction. Perhaps this is premature; but may I at all events earnestly urge the Prime Minister and our delegation to discuss the matter, and when he comes back next session, to have something definite to report to the House in regard to ways and means and prospects of getting through such a constitutional change? I presume this would be simply an amendment to the British North America Act enabling us to change the act without the consent of the British parliament.

Now with regard to the question of the Hindu franchise, I should like to offer just one or two brief comments. We have not yet

[Mr. Good.]

fathomed this question. I think the discussion has been, if I may say so, without offending hon. gentlemen who have spoken, rather shallow in respect to that matter. I sometimes think of the old and well-known statement "God hath made of one blood all nations of men." We will at some time or another have to recognize that truth.

Mr. McBRIDE: He put the sea between them to keep them apart.

Mr. GOOD: Perhaps so, but the sea at the present time is not something that keeps nations apart. It is rather a well-travelled road, a pathway between nations, and we have arrived at a stage in the history of the world when we have to think a little deeper than we have in the past in regard to these relationships between nations and races. I recognize full well the difficulties, but I would submit to the House that this is a matter that we ought to consider with the greatest possible degree of sympathy for those whose skins do not happen to be of our colour.

I venture, in conclusion, to ask some definite questions of the Prime Minister. I hope he will pay attention to those questions because I want him to answer them if possible as definitely as he can. I will ask the questions in order so that he can answer them. Have any recent proposals come to this government from the British government in connection with these conferences?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The agenda speaks for itself, and the agenda has been placed on record in Hansard.

Mr. GOOD: Has there been nothing further?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not say that there has been nothing further, because there has been in the agenda a reference to one or two matters which the British government asked should, for the present, be regarded as confidential. I therefore am not at liberty to give to the House a statement in regard to them. Whether before I leave for England, the British government will take a different view of that or not, I cannot say.

Mr. GOOD: This is what I wanted to find out, namely whether or not there was anything of a confidential character that had come to the government's attention apart from the agenda which we had placed before us.

The next question is this: Will the Prime Minister give to the House to-night some declaration of general policy on his part or on the part of the government regarding

their attitude as they go to this conference? Will he, before this discussion is over, give some statement to the House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I find a little difficulty in appreciating what my hon. friend means by a definite statement of attitude. If he asks me as regards any particular matter, I will endeavour to convey to him what the attitude of the government is. But I could not attempt in a statement to convey to my hon. friend what view the government may take in regard to every question that will come up at the conference.

Mr. GOOD: I quite understand that the Prime Minister cannot go into details in a matter of this sort. but it is very desirable that before the delegation goes to the conference, this House should have some rough idea of the point of view, shall I say, of the government. Let me ask one or two further questions. Are there likely to be raised any questions as to constitutional changes? Does this government propose to raise any such questions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can speak only for this government; I cannot speak for the governments of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Great Britain. So far as we are concerned, we do not propose to raise any questions of constitutional changes. I may say further that in that regard the position of the government would be very much that expressed in a resolution which I moved when in opposition in reference to the conference which my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was about to attend:

> That the House, while recognizing the propriety of Canada being represented at any Imperial Conference or conference of the Prime Ministers of the Empire that may be called, desires to record its opinion that at the coming conference no steps should be taken in any way involving any change in the relations of Canada to other parts of the Empire.

I would feel that that is the attitude which the country would expect us to take if a question of that kind came up.

Mr. CHURCH: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he would kindly place the United Farmers of Ontario platform, which was one to get in on and not to stand on, before the conference.

Mr. GOOD: Does the Prime Minister expect the question of imperial preferential tariffs to be raised? Does he propose to raise it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. I imagine the question of imperial preferences will be raised. I understand that Australia has intimated that she would like to raise that question. If it is raised, the attitude which I will take as regards Canada will be that the matter of a preference is a matter for each parliament to decide for itself.

Mr. GOOD: Does the Prime Minister expect the question of imperial federation to be raised?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am inclined to think the question of imperial federation has gone to sleep for a time.

Mr. DICKIE: I wish to say a few words on the Hindu question, a subject which has been pretty well ventilated in this House to-night. I hardly agree with many of the sentiments enunciated by hon. members who have spoken about those people, and who have prated about the brotherhood of man. If they lived in British Columbia, they would have different ideas with respect to the oriental races.

With respect to the Hindus, it is generally understood that there are between 1,000 and 1,200 Hindus in British Columbia. If they were all of the caste or calibre of Mr. Sastri, the question would be a different one entirely; that gentleman seems to have hypnotized people throughout Canada by his brilliance. As regards the 1,200 or so Hindus we have in British Columbia, I should judge that about 1,000 at least were low caste Hindus. If they had a vote, they would not know what to do with it; they would simply be voted as a unit by the other 200.

Mr. JACOBS: Is there not a chance that they would vote for the Tory party?

Mr. DICKIE: The hon. member might believe that such might be the case, if they were enfranchised, but I do not think the Tory party would want them. We do not need their votes in my constituency, in which there are many of them. They would vote when they got the promise that something would be given them in return. That is the way with the low caste Hindus. But the question of caste is too complex a one for me to enter into to-night, even if I were familiar enough with it to do so. Hon. gentlemen must realize this important fact, that these Hindus are not men such as we are; they have the mentality of children without childhood's innocence. You cannot comprehend the eastern mind unless you have lived among the people. They are shack-dwellers, men who do not make any effort whatever to improve the country, and they live under conditions that we could not tolerate for a moment. The Hindus will not work for us for any length of time, and they cannot adapt themselves

to our methods. In their natural community spirit, they club their funds together and erect a sawmill or engage in other undertakings, and it is impossible for us to compete with them. Those of them who go into the dairy business can live upon 10 or 15 cents a day. Our old fellows who are about ready to cross the divide used to be able to exist by means of market-gardening and from the sale of milk which they got from the one cow or so they kept. But that day has gone by, as a result of the intrusion of these orientals. I think it would be unwise on our part to grant the franchise to the Hindus. If they were all of the type of Mr. Sastri the question would be somewhat different, but as a broad principle it should be definitely laid down that we cannot afford to admit to the full citizenship of Canada any people with whom or their descendants we or our descendants cannot intermarry. On the Pacific coast we have only a strip of land, and yet we are the melting-pot for these orientals. The question is becoming a very grave one for us indeed. Since the advent of the Japanese, whose mode of living is like that of other orientals, it is exceedingly difficult for the poor white man to get along on the outskirts of any of the cities in British Columbia. The disability of the Hindus, so far as their not being allowed to vote is concerned, is a matter that is by no means so serious as some people would lead us to think. The fact that 1,000 low caste Indians in Canada have not the vote should not be a matter of grave consequence to India, for if these Hindus were in India their vote would not amount to anything, if indeed they would have any vote at all. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) has pointed this out quite clearly and I need not emphasize this particular point. Most of these people at home would be subservient to some native prince, and without the vote in Canada they are very much better off and a great deal more satisfied than they have ever been in their lives at home. I have never heard any one of them express a wish to be enfranchised. They are getting along perfectly well without the vote they are living within their means and are prosperous. If they had the vote they would simply become tools in the hands of unscrupulous politicians of one party or another and in all probability the very first thing they would ask is that their families be brought out to this country. We have no room for them. If the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) lived in British Columbia I am sure he would not father any such resolution as this. But he does not understand the question as we do; indeed, he cannot understand it because he is living apart from the facts. I claim to be absolutely unbiassed in reference to my attitude towards oriental people, whose economical virtues I quite recognize, but I repeat we have no room for them; and for the Hindu of low caste we have still less room than for others of the oriental races.

Mr. SHAW: I regret that on account of the short notice which was given of the debate any remarks I may have to make on this important subject must necessarily be fragmentary. The prospective Imperial Conference seems to follow the lines laid down at prior colonial and imperial conferences. These conferences have, I think, quite frankly had in view one definite purpose, namely, of co-ordinating as far as possible the naval, military and air forces of the Empire for purposes of common defence. It has not always been expressed just in that language but I believe it will be admitted that this has been clearly the object since the first colonial conference was held. In the development of these conferences it was soon realized that the meetings could not ultimately result in the greatest success unless some method were devised by which each of the component parts of the Empire secured adequate representation. In other words, the various communities constituting the Empire were not prepared to spend their money without having control over the objects for which that money might be used. And so to-day we have developed a system of consultation, so-called, by which —usually subsequent to the event—the various component parts of the Empire are notified as to what has taken place, and are kept informed to some extent at least as to the progress of affairs. This problem will undoubtedly receive consideration at the Conference, but it is going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to evolve any system of consultation which will be adequate to serve Canadian purposes. Let me suggest that the consultation by the prime ministers of the various dominions, even during the period when the conference is in progress, is not adequate; and I want, if I may do so, to cite an incident of the last Imperial Conference in support of what I am stating. The conference in 1921, at which Canada was represented by the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), approved of a certain policy which Lord Curzon had given effect to with regard to Egypt. Subsequently, so far as we are informed, after the conference had given its approval to Lord Curzon's policy and had disbanded, Lloyd George, in consultation with Lord Allenby, completely reversed the policy of the confer-

ence with regard to Egypt and set out upon an entirely different tack, the dominions not being consulted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say to what resolution he refers? I cannot recall any action by the conference respecting Egypt.

Mr. SHAW: That point I shall come to in a moment. The information with regard to this conference is so inadequate that one finds it difficult to get at the facts. But I am judging only from a statement made by Premier Hughes in Australia when he said that the conference had given consideration to the situation in Egypt and had come to a conclusion in connection therewith.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I should say that there is no conclusion of the conference that is not embodied in a fitting resolution; none whatever; it does not matter what anyone says. The report of the conference speaks for itself.

Mr. SHAW: Well, the report of the conference as it is presented to us is very inadequate indeed; that is all I can say. We have little information as to what purposes invited the various resolutions that were before the conference. Unfortunately I have not before me the proceedings of the conference itself, but I state that the Egyptian policy as presented by Lord Curzon was approved of by the conference and subsequently after the conference had disbanded, the policy was reversed without any reference to the various dominions of such a vital and material change.

Not only that, but I suggest that if the policy approved by the conference had been maintained, this country and the other members of the Empire would probably have found themselves in the position of fighting Egypt. Now, if this difficulty prevails in regard to consultation when the conference members are present, what must the difficulty be when the various representatives of the dominions are scattered about the four quarters of the earth? I just want, in that connection, to point out what Premier Hughes of Australia said, speaking at this 1921 conference:

> But the position in regard to policy in the future is very difficult. Every day a new situation arises, or may arise. How is it to be dealt with? We shall be scattered to the four quarters of the earth. How are the dominions to have an effective voice on foreign policy when, as things stand, they can only be told after things have been done, and are not consulted beforehand.

I may say also that the Prime Minister, Lloyd George, said in a reference to consultation:

> Communications by cable are not a means by which you can have real consultation, because you may have a particular point in view, and may alter it after hearing what is to be said on the other side.

Lord Milner apparently was of the same opinion, because he is reported to have said:

> Experience has shown that the consultation which is necessary in order to keep the different interests of the Empire in line cannot be properly effected by telegrams and despatches, between half a dozen different governments.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier many years ago refused to have any part in consultation, because, he said, consultation meant responsibility. I suggest that if we are going to take part in the foreign policy of the Empire, then we must have a hand in the framing of that policy and in its execution. But if this prevailing system of consultattion is the only part we are going to have in that policy, the method is not only ineffective but absolutely dangerous.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier never took part in consultation on foreign policy?

Mr. SHAW: No, I make no such statement. I simply say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier laid down the principle that consultation meant responsibility. I think he was correct in making that statement. Whether or not he adhered to it fully is a matter for argument. A question of foreign policy may, of course, be a question of peace or war. We realize fully in Canada to-day the significance of war, we realize what result it may have so far as our own people are concerned. We realize it is dangerous, not only to the manhood of our country but also to the wealth of our country. Canada must know, before she engages in any future war, several things. She must know whether or not the cause is a just one. She must know whether or not it is a war in which Canada should properly be involved and in which Canadian interests are involved. In the third place, she must know whether or not the war is unavoidable. These things can only be determined by Canadian representatives having a voice in the formation of the policy which may ultimately lead to war, and in addition, in the execution of that policy. I suggest that the

11 p.m. Prime Minister has laid down the proper principle for this country to follow with regard to peace or war, namely that there shall be no commitments, no declaration of war involving this country, unless the parliament of Canada first gives its approval to such a course. That, I think, is solid ground upon which to predicate our future.

I wish to speak very shortly about another matter which has been referred to by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) and that is whether or not it is proposed to discuss at this conference the advisability of subsequently holding a constitutional convention. I was very much interested in listening the other day to the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) during the discussion on the Halibut treaty, and also to the remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Morin). We hear many expressions of gratification at the status which Canada has achieved. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was not in his place at the time, otherwise I think he might have taken issue on that question of exactly what is Canada's status to-day. I remember reading last summer a statement reported in the press of that distinguished Canadian, Sir Allen Aylesworth, who suggested Canada was still a colony. Well, I suggest to hon. members of this committee that an important question is, what is our status? It is variously defined —sometimes as a partnership, sometimes as one of a league of nations within the Empire, sometimes as a component part of the Empire; and various other glittering terms are used to describe our present position. Sir Clifford Sifton, in a statement, claimed, and I think with much justification and truth, that we were allowing ourselves to be flattered by the language of the stump, and that really these terms did not correctly disclose our real status. In 1917 it was deemed advisable that at an early day a constitutional conference should be called for the purpose of defining, as far as possible, the exact status of Canada and the other dominions. In fact, it was on the programme for the 1921 conference that preparation should be made for such a constitutional conference, but, for reasons that I am not aware of, the conference was postponed. I think that was a very regrettable circumstance, and now early steps should be taken to hold a constitutional conference in order more adequately to determine the exact status of this country. That is a matter of importance for us, because when the distinguished statesmen in this country, as I have indicated, disagree, what can we expect statesmen in other countries to say? We may call ourselves a nation as much as we like, but unless foreign countries are prepared to take us at our own valuation it is simply a case of trying to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps. So I suggest the urgent need for that constitutional conference, and I trust that the Prime Minister will see to it that steps are taken in that direction. I know Premier Hughes of Australia has stated that it would be a very dangerous thing to do; that all sorts of catastrophes would be invited. I am not sure whether that prediction is justified, but I do know that the opposite is, in any case, equally true, namely, that if we proceed in the vague and indefinite course we are pursuing we may ultimately come to disaster.

I think the time has arrived for the appointment of a Canadian ambassador to Washington. Whatever misunderstanding there has been in the past with regard to that appointment, I think the Prime Minister should make it part of his duty at that conference to state our position frankly and clearly and to indicate that we as Canadians desire to have a representative at our neighbour's capital. Our interests are largely interwoven with the interests of the United States, and it is important that our representative should be there at the earliest possible date. I need only refer in proof of that to the latest instance we have had, the Halibut treaty. There is a case in which a triangular correspondence resulted not only in delay but in embarrassment, and in many cases in the future it might even result in disaster. I suggest that we want in Washington a Canadian who is thoroughly conversant with our conditions, who is familiar with our problems and who can speak authoritatively on behalf of the government of Canada. I trust that the Prime Minister will take adequate steps to see that whatever difficulties there may be in the way of that appointment are promptly removed in order that this much to be desired end may be accomplished.

One would think in listening to the members from British Columbia that this problem of the Indian question was a very simple one, that exclusion was the only adequate remedy, and that the question could be justly settled by that quick and easy method. May I suggest to the Prime Minister that this question will be one of the most serious problems that will confront the Imperial Conference? The question has been raised in the colony of Kenya in East Africa and is there to-day a vital problem. Representatives I believe of the various conflicting interests in Kenya colony are now in London and propose to take this matter up before the Imperial Conference. It is important that this matter be decided not on narrow, sectional lines but in a broad spirit of fairness and of justice, and I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will give to that problem the sincere and deep study that it merits.

I have just one other suggestion to make and it is this. We have heard much of late years about secret diplomacy and its perils. I trust that steps will be taken in order that the fullest publicity may be given to the proceedings of this Imperial Conference. I see no reason at all if peace be the object of that conference why the whole proceedings should not be made public. I know no reason for keeping from the Canadian public at least the full facts involved in all the problems and in addition the remarks of all the statesmen who may attend the conference and the conclusions at which they arrive. If we ever hope to get anywhere in this country it is by a full, frank and fair statement of the facts and by an equally frank and candid discussion of those facts. I therefore trust that the Prime Minister will leave no stone unturned to see that the fullest publicity is given to the proceedings of this conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just before the resolution carries I would like to say a word in regard to the granting of the franchise to the Indians which has been referred to. Perhaps I cannot do better than to state to the House just what I said to Mr. Sastri when he was in Ottawa. As hon. members will recall, Mr. Sastri made a trip through the different parts of the British Empire, visiting the several dominions, and came to Canada, I think, last of all. While he was in this country he was the guest of the country, and when he came to Ottawa we invited him to meet the members of the government in cabinet council. We discussed with him there very freely and openly the situation as we view it in Canada, pointing out the difficulties which we have in endeavouring to solve that problem, and seeking to gain from him the difficulties with which India is confronted through the situations that may arise in other parts of the Empire. When Mr. Sastri left I sent him the following letter expressing the government's attitude in the matter:

OTTAWA, September 5, 1922.

The Right Honourable V. SRINIVASA SASTRI,
Chateau Laurier, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. SASTRI,

In reply to the representations made by you at the interview with my colleagues and myself on Friday of last week, and which were the subject of further conference betwen us yesterday, I desire to assure you that, at the earliest favourable moment, the government will be pleased to invite the consideration of parliament to your request that natives of India resident in Canada be granted a Dominion parliamentary franchise on terms and conditions identical with those which govern the exercise of that right by Canadian citizens generally.

The subject is necessarily one which parliament alone can determine. It will be submitted to parliament for consideration when the franchise law is under revision.

In conveying to the government of India an expression of the attitude of the government of Canada in this matter, we hope that you will not fail to make it clear that at the present time, in eight out of the nine provinces of which our Dominion is composed, the federal franchise is granted to natives of India resident in Canada, on terms which are identical with those applicable generally to Canadian citizens.

Your sincerely,
(sgd) W. L. MACKENZIE KING.

I might say that the point on which particular emphasis was laid in conversation with Mr. Sastri was the fact that our Dominion is a federation of provinces, that in the distribution of seats in this House regard is had primarily to the provinces, each province being allowed a certain proportion in relation to the others, and that at all times the provinces of the Dominion have had regard for each other's problems, that nothing could be more unfortunate than that an effort should be made on the part of any province or group of provinces to coerce, so to speak, any other province in regard to any matter which was of great concern to it, that the federal government could not afford to ignore the prevailing sentiment in any province. I pointed out to Mr. Sastri that when the Dominion franchise law would be under review, mentioning in that connection that it would come up for review in all probability before any general election was held, doubtless it would be referred to a committee of the House to consider and that the representations which he had made would be presented to the committee, but that what was of most importance was how the members from the province of British Columbia themselves would view the matter. I said quite frankly that if the members from the province of British Columbia regardless of political party were to be favourable to having the franchise granted to the Indians in British Columbia, the rest of parliament would fall cordially into harmony with their view, that on the other hand if there was no agreement among the members of the province of British Columbia on this question, if it were clear to the members of this House that so far as British Columbia was concerned instead of being in favour of granting the franchise they were all pretty much the other way, it was hardly probable that the members of parliament generally would seek to impose any view upon them which would be contrary to their wishes. In other words, that it was very doubtful how any situation of unrest in one part of the British Empire could be improved by creating a new condition of unrest in

another part. That was broadly the nature of the representations made to Mr. Sastri. I believe it is the true situation. I cannot see unless there is among the people of British Columbia themselves some general agreement as to what is wisest and best in regard to this matter, and that after all is best attested by the members for the province of British Columbia in this House, that the rest of the Dominion would be helping the situation materially by forcing a view contrary to that which is entertained by its members in that province. If, however, the members of the province of British Columbia are divided on the matter and there is any preponderating view one way or the other, I think that is a circumstance of which parliament would take account, but the important factor is that the question of whether or not the franchise is to be granted to the Indians of British Columbia is a matter, so far as I can see, not to be determined at any Imperial Conference, but to be decided by this parliament in settling the franchise for membership in this House.

Item agreed to.

Amount required for expenses of delegates to Imperial Economic conference, $25,000.

Mr. GOOD: When I rose before to speak on this question I remarked that I had left my notes upstairs. I continued to leave them there because I think the House is not deirous of hearing any long speech from me, or from anyone else, at the present time. I will be very brief. I simply want to suggest to the House and to the government that one matter of prime importance be submitted by this government to the Economic Conference—I refer to the question which we had under consideration in the committee on Banking and Commerce: that of the stablizing the purchasing power of money. I do not suppose there has been any economic question or any economic problem which has been more serious, in recent years at all events, than that problem. We had before the committee Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale University, who has made a special study of this matter for some twenty years, and he gave us his assurance that a solution of the problem was quite within the realm of possibility or probability. Now, I have given some little thought and consideration to this matter, particularly since Professor Fisher was here and I want to state to the House that all authorities which I can find on the subject are agreed that the problem is one of tremendous importance—that the stabilizing of the price level, or in other words the stabilizing of the purchasing power of money, is fundamental to prevent succeeding periods of what we call business booms and business depressions. Moreover, through the fluctuation in the purchasing power of money, great injustice has been done and is being done to our citizens. Dr. Fisher stated when he was here, that one of the economists in the United States had figured out that during the war years and shortly afterwards there had been an unjust transfer of wealth—what he described as wholesale pickpocketing—in the United States—to the extent of 40 billions of dollars; and he enumerated at considerable length the continued misfortunes, disasters, difficulties and miseries that follow upon the fluctuations in the purchasing power of money. Dr. Fisher has written a number of books on the subject and recently, I presume owing party to his influence, the matter has been brought to the attention of the congress of the United States. Indeed, a bill was presented during the last session of congress dealing with this particular matter, a bill providing for stabilizing the purchasing power of money or, as Dr. Fisher puts it, "stabilizing the dollar." Now, in the course of the discussion which we had in the committee, it developed that there were two ways of doing this highly necessary and important thing. The first method was to regulate the amount of gold in the dollar where a country was on a gold basis, or, to use Dr. Fisher's phrase, to standardize the gold standard. The second method was to control the volume of credit instruments through the regulation of the interest rate. This matter was referred to by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) the other day, and has received a good deal of attention from modern economists. When Dr. Fisher was here he suggested that probably the most feasible means of stabilizing the purchasing power of money was through international action. The question was indeed considered to some extent at the Genoa Conference, and he suggested that at any future conferences this matter should be further considered. I should like to suggest therefore—if I were permitted I should like to move in the committee, although I do not know just in what shape we can put a motion through—that this question be sent forward from this parliament to the Economic Conference at London for consideration; because if something could be suggested in the way of joint action between the constituent parts of the British Empire I think it would be very easy to enlist the co-operation of

the United States, particularly in view of the fact that the matter has already entered the field of practical politics over there. Therefore, it is not unlikely that we might get all the English speaking nations of the world to take the matter up, and thus a very great gain might be secured in a relatively short time. I wish I were fully able, I wish I had the time—if the House was in the mood to listen—to submit evidence in support of the suggestion and recommendation that I make. But I will simply leave it at that. If the House will support the suggestion I shall be very glad; but if the matter continues to be ignored I shall at least have done my duty in bringing it to the attention of the House.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Department of Justice—	
To provide for a law clerk-stenographer..	$1,020
To provide for a clerk -stenographer..	960
Salary of James White, technical advisor..	6,000
Exchequer Court of Canada—one statutory increase omitted in the main estimates.. ..	180

Mr. GOOD: Could we have some explanation of the item of $6,000 in this resolution?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. White is an expert who has for some time past been devoting special study to one of the boundary disputes into which the Department of Justice is inquiring at the present time. For years he was secretary of the Conservation Commission. He has a very wide knowledge of scientific and technical problems, and is being retained in the Department of Justice where this inquiry is going on.

Mr. GOOD: Is he being added to the staff of the Department of Justice, or has he been transferred from another department?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He was there last year, but has not completed his work as yet.

Mr. GRAHAM: He went to the Department of Justice from another department.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Department of the Interior—to increase the salary of W. W. Cory, Deputy Minister of the Interior, to $8,000 per annum, $2,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with the increases we have here I observe that while there are a good many departments in which increases are made all of them do not appear in the list. I observe, for example, that the Department of Customs is not there. Nor is the Department of Agriculture there. I do not know why it is; because my hon. friend justly claimed that there was a great volume of work done there, and as great responsibility in that department as in any other. But the Department of Customs is omitted. I would like to get some idea as to the lines on which the government is proceeding, and also as to whether the government really think, irrespective of the merits of these deputies, that in a year like the present, with a budget such as has been presented, it is advisable to advance salaries that are already as high as $6,000 a year.

Mr. FIELDING: With regard to the particular deputies mentioned, I can assure my hon. friend that there is no desire to discriminate. The Deputy Minister of Customs, to whom he referred, is a most faithful, able and efficient officer, and I would be the last to permit any discrimination against him. The salaries of the deputies is a troublesome question at all times. We have adopted a rule which, when I mention it, I think will be accepted. It was felt at first that the salaries of the deputies were not high and that there was fair claim for consideration. Then it was argued with some force that regard must be had to length of service, and the decision we reached was that in the case of any deputy in active service at the head of a department who had a service to his credit of ten years or more, we would consider that he was entitled to an advance; but those whose term of service were less than ten years were left out, not because they were not capable or efficient, but because it was held, and I think with reason, that some regard should be had to the term of service. At all events, that is the explanation. In every case where a deputy has served for ten years or more, and is in active service at the head of the department, he receives the increase, unless he already has the increased salary; but as to the others there is no discrimination, except that which arises from the term of service.

Mr. MARTELL: The Minister of Finance has stated that it required ten years of service in order to get the increase. I have only to say that I happen to have had the honour of serving for five years under one of the best deputy ministers in any of the departments at Ottawa, Mr. Alexander Johnston; and I want to say there is not a man in the Dominion of Canada more capable of presiding over a department than Mr. Johnston. He happened to have had the extreme privilege of being born on the Atlantic seaboard, and he had received a good education which is backed up by good common sense. Mr. Johnston is a man who is capable of earn-

ing money outside of the department to a very much greater amount than he is receiving here. I believe that on one occasion he was offered a position at $20,000 a year, but he is in love with his present work. Being a maritime man he knows the work, and knows what is required of a man in the position of Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and I believe if the government of Canada never did anything else than to give Mr. Johnston a salary of $10,000—and it is only one-fifth of what he is worth—they would be doing sufficient to justify their being returned to power in this country. His salary should be $20,000. I know what I am talking about, because I served in that department and I have had practical knowledge which is more than most of the members of this House have had. I have this knowledge from having been born on the seaboard, having been a sailor, and having served under Mr. Johnston.

Mr. SHAW: I am not one of those who would refuse to give faithful servants adequate pay. I think that the move of the minister is a desirable one. I think if we are going to get competent men to handle these big departments of the government service, we must pay them adequate salaries. I desire to make it clear that I have no objection to the proposed increases. I do not know that I would go to the extent the government indicate in applying the increase after ten years to every officer of the standing of a deputy minister. There are some of these departments which must be more or less insignificant, when compared with large departments like the Departments of Marine and Fisheries and the Interior; and I do not know that I would apply the principle that far. I also want to make this suggestion: The deputy ministers in charge of large departments can, if they so desire, save thousands of dollars annually to the country. I do not know whether they are doing it or not. I think steps should be taken to see that the public services are properly co-ordinated, in order to ensure our getting the greatest possible efficiency. One can realize the tendency of deputy ministers. They are human as well as anybody else, and as soon as they get control of a large department, I suppose there is a desire to secure by accretion, other services, regardless of whatever services may be carried on of a similar nature in other departments. I have had occasion to look into this matter to some extent and when one finds that dredging service is carried on by three separate departments, apparently without much justification, when one finds surveying services are carried on by three or more departments, it makes one wonder whether these deputy ministers are themselves co-ordinating the services. They apparently have not done it. I think the government should make it one of its first duties to see that these services are co-ordinated, to prevent overlapping and over-manning, and in this connection I am sure that if they do not secure, they will at any rate demand, the hearty co-operation of the ministers concerned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member (Mr. Martell) suggests that Mr. Johnston, the deputy minister, did have an offer a good deal bigger than his salary. That is true and Mr. Johnston did go with the British Steel Corporation but now he is back again, to take his $6,000. I think the manner in which the government is going about this matter is simply to follow the line of least resistance, and the worst line it can possibly take having any regard to efficiency or economy. Work ought to be paid for having regard to its importance. We have some departments here where the work is only a multiple of the work of other departments. There is no question about it. Everyone who knows anything about the matter knows that is perfectly true. That whole question of efficiency and of results is to be absolutely discarded for the purpose of adopting some safe and easy road, which will enable the government to increase the salaries of some picked deputies. That is being done. Merit has nothing to do with it at all. It only depends upon how long the man has been drawing his pay. Merit has absolutely nothing to do with this particular increase, which is merely on account of length of service. I would like the Finance Minister to tell this House what possible justification there is for the consideration of the increases in the Supplementary Estimates brought down now. What excuse can be given that would satisfy the most credulous that these matters ought not to have been considered in the Main Estimates instead of the Supplementaries? I am going to ask my hon. friend whether he does not think efficiency should have something to do with it, and whether he does not think that the weight of work ought to have something to do with it. I do not want to pick out a department here or a department there. I need not do it. He knows them just as well as I do and better, but he knows that some of the heaviest departments are not represented here. He mentioned Customs. I mentioned Customs myself. What about Agriculture?

Mr. FIELDING: Suppose we admit, for the sake of argument, that it would have been wiser that these things should have been brought down in the Main Estimates. Having dealt with that point, let us now consider the merits of the question. If we need a deputy minister in this country and if a man is capable of filling that office, a salary of $8,000 a year is not too much to pay him. If he has had long service added to his merit and strength of character, $8,000 is not too much. The trouble is, I think, that in our higher positions we do not pay men enough, and men are therefore being drawn away from the service of Canada and taken into private service because we cannot pay them enough. I have a case in mind of a man I should very well like to have had in the service of my department. I could not keep him because the ordinary custom of the House would not allow me to give him a proper salary, but he went to another place and received twice as much as he could get here. We must pay some regard to the dignity of this office, to the importance of the duties. But my hon. friend must have found in his day that it was exceedingly difficult to distinguish. The law fixes the salaries of nearly all the deputies at one figure. When I came into the department first the deputies, with one or two exceptions, received $3,200 a year. Their salaries have been advanced from time to time and, I think, with regard to the changes that have taken place, the increases in all lines, $8,000 is not too much to pay a deputy if he is competent and has had ten years' service. Length of service is entitled to some consideration. I do not know how you can discriminate. You cannot make the minister of any department believe that the position of his deputy is inferior to that of any other. We all magnify our offices a little. The minister magnifies his and the deputy magnifies his. I know there are differences; I know there are some departments which are much heavier than others, but it is by no means an easy thing to distinguish between them. As regards the increase, I do not know any deputy who is getting $8,000 a year who is not deserving of that amount if he is capable of filling the office.

Mr. GOULD: I rise to ask a question: Are there any perquisites attached to the office, for instance, rent-free houses, motor cars, chauffeurs?

Mr. FIELDING: Nothing that I know of. I think in the Department of Agriculture some of the officials are provided with houses on the farms, but I think that is taken into consideration. As regards the deputies concerned in this vote, they have no perquisites whatever.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the case of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture the amount, $500, is taken off his salary.

Mr. KAY: I do not often agree with my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) but I think he has improved so much to-night that I can almost agree with some of the things that he has said. I find it difficult to understand on what principle some of the deputies receive $8,000 a year, some $6,000 and some $10,000. There are in the service four deputy ministers receiving $10,000 a year. At least two of these gentlemen have not been in the service or have not held the position of deputy minister for anything like ten years. The Commissioner of Taxation, I understand, receives $10,000 a year and he has not held that position for anything like ten years. I have nothing to say against the increases which are being proposed to-night. I think, as a rule, the higher civil servants are underpaid; but I wish to say a word on behalf of the deputies of two of the departments, who are not receiving this increase. I refer to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and the Deputy Minister of Customs and Excise. Both of these departments are very large and the work is very heavy and important. Both are manned by men of exceptional ability and particularly suited for their positions. Doctor Grisdale, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, is a man of very great ability, a man who has devoted all his life to the work of that department and of the experimental farms. He has been in the service of the government for some twenty-three or twenty-four years, and surely that length of service should be taken into consideration when we are considering raising the salaries of deputies. I do not wish to delay the committee at this time, but I would strongly urge the Minister of Finance to consider the work that these gentlemen have to do, the importance of their services to the country, the length of time that they have given to the service of the government, and that he grant the increase, a well-merited increase it would be, to the Deputy Ministers of Agriculture and of Customs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree with the Minister of Finance that it is always difficult to do the right thing. Of course it is difficult to discriminate. It is always difficult to pick who is right and who is wrong. It is always easy to do the opposite.

Mr. FIELDING: What does my hon. friend think would be right?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To pay the salary where it is earned. My hon. friend is discriminating. I have discriminated; but when I became Minister of Finance, if I remember aright, the Deputy Minister of Justice was getting $10,000 a year. I increased the salary of the Commissioner of Taxation to $10,000 a year. I did that for very specific reasons.

Mr. CARROLL: What were they?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I could not lose him. If there was one man who had heavy responsibilities in an almost unchecked position, it would be the Commissioner of Taxation. A man, who, as the present Minister of Finance told us the day before yesterday, has handled $200,000,000 of taxation under regulations which had to be fixed and determined by him under the most intricate act, and who has collected everything except $8,000,000 to date, was a man who was worth keeping, and he was kept. My hon. friend comes in, and he in his turn does some discriminating. The present Deputy Minister of Finance was appointed three years ago, I think, say three and a half, certainly not more than that. My hon. friend makes his salary $10,000. My hon. friend did not deal with the matter on a question of a ten-year service. He dealt with it from a question of merit. What has been done here is merely to apply an arbitrary rule of length of employment, with absolutely no regard to the volume of work or to the importance of the department. The reason for the adoption of this plan, we are told, is the difficulty of making a selection. I think that the whole idea is entirely wrong. The increases ought to have been brought down in the Main Estimates and we should then have had an opportunity of looking into the various departments. But there is very little chance of doing that now. Were we not told that generally speaking these were votes that could not have been put in the Main Estimates? Yet here we have something that has stood for so many years when the cost of living, according to my hon. friends, was higher than it is to-day and when the financial conditions looked as well as they do now, if, indeed, not better. If the government are determined to put this matter through in this way I do not want to delay them, but there is neither fairness nor any business idea in what they are doing. One would suppose that they would be anxious to economise, but if they insist that the salary of $6,000 paid to certain persons should be increased they can increase it. If they want to deal with an important question of this kind in the Supplementary Estimates, a method that deprives one absolutely of all opportunity for consideration, and of any means of answering the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay), they are, I suppose, at liberty to do so. But again I say, the responsibility is entirely theirs; and we have the spectacle of a party that prates about economy adopting this attitude in connection with this important matter.

Mr. MILLAR: It is rather regrettable that this increase must be made at this time when the financial condition of Canada is so appalling. I can understand the difficulty of the government in retaining really good men when other concerns are willing to offer them more than they are now getting. But my mind goes back to two instances that came to my notice, one of which no doubt the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) will recall. An able deputy minister left the service on a question of salary alone. He was a very good man and I well remember that it was not very many years after he had left the service before he discovered, when he went to sell his labour in the markets of the world, that his experience with the government had imbued him with very little appreciation of the value of money, and for that reason he did not make a success. The result was that he was very ready to come back; I think he was one of the most willing men to enter the service again. Another case I have in mind is that of a gentleman in the employ of the late government managing one of the farms. He was offered a large sum elsewhere and he thought he was going to be able to make twice as much as he was getting from the government. He left the service and after six or seven years—in fact, last fall—he was eager to return. I am not sure that he is under this government, but at any rate he is in a similar position to the one he held before. Both gentlemen, I am sure, were able in their respective fields, and I am convinced that from their experience neither of them would now think for a moment of leaving governmental employment. In my opinion, if any of the deputies contemplate taking such a step they would do well to consult these gentlemen to whom I have referred. If they did, and they acted on the advice they would no doubt receive, I believe they would reconsider their decision. It depends, I suppose, on the comparison you make in deciding whether deputies are receiving what they

are worth when they get $6,000. When you compare a salary of $6,000, as paid to a deputy minister, with salaries ranging from $15,000 to $20,000 paid to men engaged in occupations with big interests, the discrepancy would of course suggest that the deputies are being underpaid. But compare their salary with the salaries paid to the thousands of men in their own walk of life who are equally efficient and whose remuneration is by no means $15,000 or anything like it,—as a matter of fact, not a quarter as much in many cases as the deputies receive—and you will realize that the deputies are not so ill-paid after all. It is difficult to say just what a man is worth, and we have nothing but the bald statement that gentlemen who fill these positions efficiently are worth $8,000. I believe that a deputy would be worth this sum if he were willing to save the thousands that he could save by standing firmly against the pressure brought to bear upon him by his staff in urging larger salaries for themselves. But I fear that in some departments, particularly in the Public Works and the Interior departments, there has not been anything like a firm stand against such pressure. It is apparent that in some departments there has been a considerable practice of economy; but in others this has not been true. All things considered, it would have been well had the government tried to get along for the present without raising the salaries in the way they propose, because there is no possibility of getting them down again. Not only will the present recipients get this extra $2,000, but it is altogether likely that the increased sum will stand for all time as the fixed salary for the office. It is very easy to raise salaries but not so easy to lower them. Not only that; the mere raising of the salaries of the deputies will have a tendency to excite an agitation for increases on the part of those subordinate to them. As soon as the deputies get $8,000 the employees will want their salaries raised, and it will mean on the whole a very much larger expenditure for the Dominion than if the government could get along with the salaries at present paid.

Mr. LOGAN: Personally I think this is a wise move that should have been made long ago. On the second page of the Supplementary Estimates there appear certain names the first of which I read is that of Sir Joseph Pope, to whom it is proposed to pay $8,000. Here is a man who has been forty years in the service of the country. He has been the trusted and loyal deputy of ministers of different political faiths and is probably the best informed man in Canada on external affairs. Yet he is being paid just $8,000.

Mr. MARTELL: Six thousand.

Mr. LOGAN: I am referring to the new estimates. On the other hand there are men employed in most inferior positions in big houses in the cities of the country that are drawing fifty per cent more than this proposed salary to this excellent officer. Take the next name, Mr. Alexander Johnston.

Mr. MARTELL: One of the best fellows in Canada.

Mr. LOGAN: He is not only a good deputy, but is probably one of the ablest men we have in the Dominion. Does anyone say that $8,000 is too much for this man who protects the interests of the Marine and Fisheries department as if he owned the department? I think he devotes not eight hours a day, but eighteen hours a day to his work. Take the third man, Mr. J. B. Hunter, of the Public Works department, an extremely able man with an experience in the department extending over twenty-six or twenty-seven years. Mr. Hunter is a very competent official who never thinks of the hours he devotes to the service of the department. Then, take Mr. Thomas Mulvey. There is no doubt that Mr. Mulvey could go out of the Department of State and secure a position as counsel in any legal firm in Canada at a salary of $20,000 a year.

Mr. MARTELL: Is Mr. Mulvey the author of Mulvey's Company Law of Canada?

Mr. LOGAN: He is the same man.

Mr. MARTELL: He would be knighted if we had titles in Canada.

Mr. LOGAN: The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has contended that we should pay deputy ministers according to the extent and importance of the work of the department. Does that apply to ministers?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It ought to.

Mr. LOGAN: It does not; it has never been claimed that it did. Ministers are paid the same, whether Secretary of State, or Minister of Public Works, or Minister of Justice. There are two reasons why these men should receive adequate compensation: First, as a return for faithful and loyal service, and, second, as an inducement to them to remain in the service. Take the Deputy Minister of Justice. Why, not long ago there was a discussion about certain legal charges made in connection with the Grand Trunk arbitration.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is my hon. friend seeking to delay this estimate? There is no suggestion of increasing the salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice. He is already getting $10,000.

Mr. LOGAN: I am saying a word on behalf of men who are deserving and I am also objecting to the inference made by the hon. member in reference to my friend Alex. Johnston of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Do you mean to tell me that Mr. Newcombe could not have left the Department of Justice years ago and have received, not $10,000 a year, as he is paid now, but $50,000 a year, or, at the rate of remuneration given in the case of the Grand Trunk arbitration, $100,000 a year? He has remained there not for the money that is in it, but out of loyalty to the department and to the service of this country. I believe in paying a man a worthy wage.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that these officials are very much underpaid. You cannot get a good man in the Civil Service to-day unless you pay him well. Any of these deputy ministers could go into the outside world and earn twice the salary they receive in the service. As a matter of fact, the whole civil service is underpaid. I hope the government will next session bring down the cost of living bonus and make it permanent. There has been a period of high prices for five or ten years now. This increase of salaries is very well merited; it is but a small return for the service rendered.

Mr. TOLMIE: Before this vote passes I would like to point out that the men who are listed here are all rendering excellent service. We as members have more or less to do with them, and we find them competent and obliging and quite capable of filling their positions. But I regret that one of the most important deputy ministers in the whole service, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, has not received an increase in salary. No industry in Canada is more capable of improving the business of the country or of bringing about prosperity than agriculture. In my opinion there is no more important industry from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and in the office of no deputy minister is a greater or more varied knowledge required of the work in hand than in that of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. As minister in charge of that department for about two years I had an opportunity of working with Dr. Grisdale, who had already made a reputation for himself as Director of Experimental Farms and who as a deputy minister speaking both French and English was acceptable to the farmers in all parts of Canada. He rendered and is rendering most excellent service. I regret that he has not been included in this increase and I hope that the government will take the earliest opportunity of seeing that he is included.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend not believe that a man who is capable of being the deputy minister of any department should start on at least $8,000 a year? I agree with all he said about Dr. Grisdale. There should be a minimum of $8,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It has been stated that the higher paid civil servants are underpaid. I should like to call attention to the fact that the lower paid civil servants are very much underpaid. I have stated here before that in Winnipeg postal employees are receiving a smaller wage than the amount that it has been found necessary to give for the sustenance of people who are accepting municipal relief. It seems as if we ought not to advance the salaries of these higher officials, however much they may deserve it, until there has been a general revision of salaries and the lower paid employees are looked after.

12 m.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mentioned last night that in order that no one should be under the impression that the government is anxious to hasten through the estimates I would move that to-night the committee rise at twelve o'clock. Now, the government is quite prepared to do that—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —unless there is a desire on the part of all present to continue a little longer. I understand that the Senate are pretty well finished with their work and are waiting for the Supply Bill to come from this House, and there is a possibility of our proroguing to-morrow if we conclude the estimates in time. There is nothing further in the way of legislation except a few items. But of course it is entirely for the committee to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend might just as well conclude now as in the morning; we have no time to get information on these things anyway. We can work just as well now as we could to-morrow morning; we shall get just as much information. We are not saying anything about the length of time we are talking about these things; it is the length of time we require to get informa-

tion so that we can talk intelligently—that is all. So far as going on to-night is concerned, I think we ought to do so.

Mr. BELAND: The Pension bill has been returned to this House by the Senate and it has been so amended by that body that I shall find myself unable to agree with some of the amendments. If it is the desire of the committee to sit all night—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BELAND: —or two or three hours more. I suggest that the committee rise in order that we may consider the Pension Act and make whatever suggestions to the Senate we have in mind; then we can return to Supply. In the meantime we can consider the Pension Act and make whatever suggestions we think necessary to the Senate, and then resume Supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Possibly my hon. friend might agree to continue with the estimates for an hour and then take up the matter he has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 438 carry?

Mr. GOULD: In regard to the proposed salary increases for the various deputy heads I wish to place myself on record that I am not opposed to paying adequate remuneration where merit and competence is shown. I have since being honoured with this position looked upon the deputy ministers both in the capacity of supervisors of their respective departments and advisers to the ministers at the head of the departments. So far as supervision is concerned I have no criticism to make or any comments to offer, but in their capacity of adviser to the minister I have frequently drawn to the attention of this committee that I would like evidence placed before it as to their interestedness in showing why these huge sums of money are being asked in the estimates from time to time. I have made these representations to the committee from time to time simply because I have not been satisfied in my own mind that the deputy ministers themselves have appreciated the value of a one dollar bill or the importance of getting one hundred cents for a dollar, and as a result of that inappreciation they have presented large amounts in the estimates to the ministers, who in turn present them on the floor of this House and ask parliament to vote them. It seems to me that another word reiterated not alone by myself but by other members of the House that the deputy ministers show greater interest in that phase of the question might be a very good thing at this time when these increases of $2,000 for the deputies are before the committee. This is just another word that I have to offer on the subject at this time, and I think it is a word that should meet with serious consideration on the part of everyone concerned.

Mr. GOOD: I do not think we ought to be niggardly in paying our deputy ministers, but I do think that this House ought to consider the financial situation at the present time. We are going behind every year and the Finance Minister does not hold out any hope of our catching up next year. There are a lot of people in this country who are paying this money who are not getting $6,000 nor $2,000 a year. I do not want to say anything in disparagement of these gentlemen, but it does seem to me that this is an inopportune time for increasing their salaries.

Item agreed to.

Department of National Defence—to increase the salary of G. J. Desbarats, Acting Deputy Minister of National Defence, to $8,000 per annum, $2,000.

Mr. GOOD: Has the gentleman mentioned here undertaken any additional work this year?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The gentleman named here is a civil servant of long experience. He was in charge of the Department of Naval Defence and then came to the Department of National Defence. He is an experienced official in every way, and in addition to the duties he performed before, he has had assigned to him the duties pertaining to the Militia department as well as the Air branch.

Item agreed to.

Patent and Copyright Office—to increase the salary of Geo. F. O'Halloran, Commissioner of Patents, to $8,000 per annum, $2,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: In confirmation of what the ex-Minister of Agriculture has suggested I would call attention to the fact that while this item provides for an increase of $2,000 for the Commissioner of Patents and Item 445 provides for an increase of $2,000 for Mr. Doughty, the Dominion Archivist, there is no provision for an increase in the salary of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture who has been just as long in the service.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Oh no.

Mr. ARTHURS: He is just as valuable an officer as the Dominion Archivist and more important to the country. I have nothing to say against the Archivist, but it seems to

me unreasonable that he should be granted an increase of $2,000 while the Deputy Minister of Agriculture with all his experience is not granted anything.

Item agreed to.

Auditor General's office—contingencies—additional amount required for salaries of temporary clerks, $20,000; additional amount required for travelling expenses, $1,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the occasion for the very large increase in salaries, $20,000, for the Auditor General's clerks?

Mr. FIELDING: We have generally adopted the rule to give the Acting Auditor General all the assistance he requires in order to induce him to get out the documents promptly. I do not know how it was with my honourable friend, but I have always told the Acting Auditor General that I relied on him to be reasonable and I have never refused him any increase in staff at a time when it was urgent that the public documents be got out promptly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have to plead guilty to following a different course and holding up his appointments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And the reports were not out in time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that we lost anything by it. Here we are paying out $20,000.

Item agreed to.

Administration of justice, $20,560.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the minister be good enough to give us particulars of this item?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Everyone is aware of the pride that the Canadian people have taken in maintaining justice in the extreme northern country. There are six Eskimos now in custody at Herschel island up in the Arctic charged with murder and preparations are being made for their trial this summer. An expedition left Edmonton on the 12th of June for that purpose taking a judge and two counsel. The estimated cost of the expedition is $15,000. The amount here is appropriated for the purpose of carrying on the administration of justice in the extreme north.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who are the counsel?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Howat of Edmonton and Mr. Cory of Ottawa.

[Mr. Arthurs.]

Legislation—House of Commons—

To provide for the full sessional indemnity of members of the House of Commons—days lost through absence caused by illness, official public business, or on account of death during the present session—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, an act respecting the Senate and House of Commons or any amendments thereto—payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct.. .. .. $12,000

Expenses of committees, witnesses, etc.—further amount required.. 7,000

To purchase, for the use of Senators and members of Parliament, 350 copies of the Canadian Annual Review, Edition of 1922—further amount required.. 350

To provide for the full sessional indemnity of the two members of Parliament, successively representing the electoral district of Nicolet, during the session of 1923, to which indemnity the two members shall be entitled, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, or any amendment thereto; the share of each member to bear the same proportion to four thousand dollars as the number of days during which he was a member of parliament during the said session bears to the total number of days of the session during which both together were members of parliament. Payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct.. 4,000

Mr. ARTHURS: Will the Minister of Finance give an explanation of the last item?

Mr. FIELDING: That is a case where a by-election occurred, the two members—that is to say the former member and his successor—dividing the sessional indemnity in proportion to their time.

Mr. ARTHURS: According to the wording each gets $4,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh no, they divide it.

Mr. BUREAU: In proportion to the number of days.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—for experiments in the dehydration of fruits and vegetables, $10,500.

Mr. GOOD: I think we should have some explanation of this from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is to provide for experimenting with the drying of fruit. We have a big crop again this year, and we will require all the facilities that are available for the purpose of taking care of fruit during the fall season, and extending the period of marketing by every possible means. Experiments will be conducted in the matter of dehydrating.

Mr. GOOD: Was this work under way last year, or is it new work?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No it is just beginning this year.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—for expenditures in connection with trial shipment of chilled beef and fat cattle to Great Britain, $25,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much of that is for Duncan Marshall?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: None of it at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Sure?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We expect to make chilled beef of him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I don't know but that might be a useful purpose. Is it correct that Duncan Marshall is now called "High Commissioner of Canada for chilled meats"?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a new one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is he now?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He is commissioner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is he doing over in England now?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He is not over there now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is he at the present time?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I expect he will arrive in Ottawa to-night.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is immense.

Mr. BUREAU: He will chill you in the morning.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the minister give a few more particulars in regard to this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I went into the matter very fully on the Main Estimates. We made an experiment with about 100 to 125 head of cattle that we fed on the experimental farm. We sent some of them to be killed immediately on arrival there, others of them to be sold as stockers, and still others to be killed in Montreal and sent over as chilled beef. We have not got any reports of the first experiment yet. The intention is to continue the experiment during the three or four months of the summer for the purpose of keeping chilled beef on the British market and, if possible, finding out what advantage the chilled beef trade has over the stocker trade, or if it has any.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—for the suppression of foul brood in bees, $5,000.

Mr. SPENCER: We should like to have some particulars in regard to this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This foul brood is a very fatal and infectious disease which attacks bees when they are in the larva stage. It has affected a large number of bees not only throughout this province but also throughout some of the adjoining provinces. Some time ago I had the opportunity of discussing this matter with the Hon. Manning Doherty and he agreed at that time, on behalf of this government, to put up $10,000, if we would put up $5,000 for the suppression of this disease. That is what we are doing.

Mr. GOOD: Under whose supervision is this work being done?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Under the supervision of the Bee Keepers' Association. That is, they will have charge of the work. R. F. Holterman, I think, is the president or secretary.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—for the salary and expenses of an agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, $7,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: For the last year or more there has been a great deal of agitation to have in Great Britain a representative of the farm produce of Canada, to have somebody on the British market to look particularly after the exports of the farmers of Canada. Take dairy products and bacon. When they arrive on the British market if anything is wrong, or requires reporting on, or does not meet the requirements of the market, we want to be apprised immediately. I might illustrate the value of that by an incident that occurred last year. Bacterial action had taken place in a few cheese from Canada that went over there and the fact got into the British newspapers. It so happened that Dr. Grisdale was there at the time, and he corrected a false impression that went abroad in England, otherwise serious results might have ensued to our dairy industry. We need some person to take care of our exports.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the salary and how much will be allowed for expenses?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The gentleman is not appointed yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is his salary to be.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The minimum salary set by the Civil Service Commission is $5,040.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Fixed for this job? Has the minister got this job arranged by the Civil Service Commission already?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Civil Service Commission has already classified the position, but it has not been advertised yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose this position will be advertised, there will not be any appointment by order in council?

Mr. MARTELL: I think the man selected should have the rank of a deputy and should be appointed without going to the Civil Service Commission. We should have the very best man available in the country.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is this salary of $7,000 fixed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BUREAU: The salary is not $7,000 it is $5,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The salary is $5,040, and the balance is to cover expenses incidental to the position.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The appointee will be recommended by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—further amount required for health of animals, $750,000.

Mr. GOOD: We should like some explanation of this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This work is expanding very rapidly. It has been behind—that is to say the payment has been behind—ever since I have had anything to do with it. I have received a great many complaints from hon. members, especially from Alberta, that there was a good deal of delay in securing compensation for animals slaughtered. That has been due, to some extent, to not having enough money to make the necessary payments. This vote will catch up with the deficit of last year and we hope to take care of the entire work this year.

Pensions—annuity to Dr. F. G. Banting, $7,500.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to know if Dr. Banting is getting any similar grants from other sources?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say, but whether he is or is not I think this is the least the parliament of Canada could do for him as an expression of national gratitude.

Item agreed to.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Canadian Government Railways—Prince Edward Island Car Ferry Terminals—to pay claim, $196,417.63.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think I can let this vote go through at the rate we have been going. As I am instructed, the vote ought never to go through. I had a file sent over to me exactly three minutes ago. This is the size of the file, as hon. members can see. I have not been able to assimilate much information out of the file in that time. Has the Minister of Finance gone into this matter? I have been told—and I am speaking from partial memory—that this matter was entirely settled, that there was an agreement which covered the whole matter, and that this is something which need not be considered. If it should be considered, I submit Mr. Chairman, it ought not to be considered without some chance of going into it. I do not think it should have been put in the Supplementary Estimates. If the claim be a just one, I can see no reason in the world why it could not stand. I am going to ask the minister whether it may stand.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not read the file but I have heard the case explained by the Minister of Railways, and supported by his officials. I was satisfied from the information furnished that it was a fair and just claim, and I consented to having it put in the supplementaries. I am sure the Minister of Railways will be prepared to explain the matter to the hon. member.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a claim that perhaps will not be understood unless you know the men in connection with the claim. The government wished to do this work at Prince Edward Island which was a very difficult work to do. The gentlemen in question are Roger Miller and the late Mr. Caudel. The word of each of these gentlemen was as good as his bond. Because of the relationship of Mr. Roger Miller, the contractor, to the department and the confidence the department always had in him, whenever I became embarrassed or in difficulty over a contract, although he was a contractor, I called him in for consultation, and I gave him work to do that I felt could not be reliably done elsewhere. This difficult work at Prince Edward Island had to be undertaken. The minister advertised. He got one tender, I think, and the tenderer did not accept the contract.

Mr. SHAW: What was the nature of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was the building of the terminal for the Prince Edward Island car ferry, and a very difficult job.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was started in 1913. The first contractor that tendered did not take it. Then Mr. Roger Miller was called in, as I often called him in, to discuss with Mr. Cochrane the difficulties of this contract. There is no doubt in the world that Mr. Roger Miller was not looking for the contract. He was induced to take this contract by the minister. When I was minister I often induced him to take contracts for which he was not tendering. Tenders were called for in the regular way, and Roger Miller, as I absolutely believe, was asked to tender low, so that he would get the contract. In addition to that he was told by the minister that any loss he sustained would be made good, but he wanted him to tender and get that contract. Any person who has been at the head of the department can readily understand that attitude in a work of this kind when one contractor has backed out. He proceeded with the work. The legal gentlemen will say that when there is a written instrument it is the bargain, but not in this case. Roger Miller, whose word was as good as his bond, somewhere in the documents has made an affidavit pointing out that he took the contract with the distinct understanding mentioned and I can understand it thoroughly. He was to go on and do the work, and if it cost more than the contract he was to lose no money. He went on and did the work, and I think it ended in 1917 or 1918. His affidavit is in the file. I may be told that it is an old contract. Well, it is, but in 1917 under the contract, if this be taken as the bargain—which it is not at all in my mind; I am absolutely certain it was not—he could not perhaps be allowed anything. The chief engineer thought so, under the strict terms of the contract, and he emphasized in his report the words "under the contract". Now the reason the matter was not settled before was this: It was necessary to purchase a special plant for this work, and as with all the contractors, a contract cannot be finally settled until the plant is disposed of or valued. From the conclusion of the contract until this spring there was no opportunity of disposing of the plant, and the department had sent auditors to find out, not any profit of Roger Miller, but what the absolute loss to him on this contract was, and this is the amount the auditors returned to me as the amount of loss. The affidavit of Mr. Miller, whose ability as a contractor and whose integrity are above reproach, points out that he did the work under these conditions, and I absolutely believe it to be true, knowing the man and understanding how under the circumstances he took the contract under the conditions stated. We have had the books audited to find out what the loss was, and this is the result.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to find out one or two facts. I cannot get anything out of this maze of documents. The contract was in 1913. When was the work done?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it was completed between 1917 and 1918.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the date of the final certificate?

Mr. GRAHAM: I might say the contractors would not at any time accept any payment as final.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Here is a letter at the commencement of the file. The file I am interested in is the file with the contract in it, to show something about the inception of the matter. On the 29th January the Department of Railways forwarded the cheque of the Finance Department for $6,728.72 in payment of the final estimate, and then it is quite true that this letter of receipt from the Roger Miller Company shows that they do not accept it as a final cheque. The letter says:

> We do not admit the validity of the claims amounting to $1,631.26, nor do we accept the cheque in question as a settlement of our final estimate, owing to the fact that there are matters pending between us and the department which will have to be gone into before the amount of the final estimate can be arrived at. We are sending you this intimation now, so that there may be no misunderstanding on the subject.

I point out that the final estimate and cheque were forwarded January 29 last. I wonder if the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister are at all serious when they say that they want proper consideration given to these items. This is just a little bit of the file. Surely my hon. friend must see that this is a farce, and that the only proper thing to do is to transfer this item to the main vote of next year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I try to run my department just as I would run my own business, and no person has accused me of doing anything else. It is a matter of straight business between man and man, and I think no government ought to do anything else. I have investigated this, and I am as convinced as I am living that the Department of Railways and Canals owes Roger Miller this money under the arrangement he made with Mr. Cochrane. If we were to go at the matter technically and work it out, I believe Roger Miller would have a bigger claim.

In fact, he claimed more than this, and we sent an auditor down for the purpose of going through his books; Mr. Miller threw all his books open; the auditor went through them from one end to the other, and he brought in a report. It is on the basis of that report that I am asking that this settlement shall be made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM: The contract would be in the law branch. I thought I had the whole file.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I told my hon. friend this afternoon that this was a matter which I thought ought to be looked into in the interest of the country.

Mr. GRAHAM: A synopsis of the contract is in the order in council on the file.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be a synopsis. Are there two contracts?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was the work done as originally proposed?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, it was much more expensive than originally proposed. They put in concrete instead of wood.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was a change. Was a contract entered into after the change was made?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been told explicitly that a contract was made for a specific sum.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that there was nothing of the kind; that there was only the original contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then if the appropriation passes in this way that these files will be all open for our investigation, and that an investigation will be given into the whole of this matter, I do not propose to take up any more time.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has a right to get these papers at any time he wants them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only time that they are any good is now, unless we have an understanding that the whole of this is subject to re-opening.

Mr. GRAHAM: What does my hon. friend mean by "re-opening?"

[Mr. Graham.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I mean an investigation at the time the next House sits.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend would have a perfect right to do that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I could be and would be voted down easily.

Mr. GRAHAM: Our majority is not so big.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It might be big enough then.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the vote carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not saying that the vote carries until I get information on the subject. Of course if we are to get no information, all right.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have given my friend all the information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I asked for the files this afternoon. I get part 7 at exactly twenty minutes past twelve. The item was called at twenty-three minutes past twelve, and what I started with was the final certificate. That looks like giving full information, does it not?

Mr. GRAHAM: My deputy tells me that the entire file is there. I did not expect this item to come on to-night. I gave the file to my hon. friend just as soon as I got it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Might I suggest that the item stand until the hon. gentleman has time to peruse it? I think that would be satisfactory to the committee. I should like further information on the subject, and if he can find it for me that would be very satisfactory.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then it will stand until Tuesday.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It can stand until next session. I see the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Finn) laughs. He is the author of the bill that was so described in this House this session that I would have thought he would withdraw from his party after the description given of it by the Minister of Justice. I do not know what he knows about this matter.

Mr. FINN: I would like to ask the leader of the Opposition if it is a crime for any hon. gentleman in this House to laugh? I was not laughing at the right hon. gentleman. I do not know what bill he refers to. If he would be more specific, perhaps he would do me the honour of giving me a definite answer instead of the uncalled-for insinuation on his part.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The bill transferring land in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FINN: I was not the author of that bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend was chairman of the committee that put it through.

Mr. FINN: My right hon. friend has been long enough in this House to know that a gentleman who is chairman of a committee is in no way, because of his occupying that position, the author of a bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is just as responsible.

Mr. BUREAU: Not a bit of it.

Mr. MARTELL: Can a chairman of a committee be shown by parliamentary procedure to be the author of a bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is sufficient responsibility to be chairman of the committee. These are simply settlements being made out of court of claims that should not be paid unless established in court. They have been attempted to be settled in this way time and time again, and they have been refused, but now they have been yielded to by this government at the expense of this country. If there are estimates that are fitted for Main Estimates alone, they are these. Perhaps the minister would remember—he was not in the House—how in a Supplemenary Estimate brought down in 1921, an item was included to pay some $40,000, a judgment of the court of Quebec, taken to the Court of Appeal in Quebec and affirmed, taken from the Court of Appeal in Quebec to the Supreme Court of Canada and affirmed. Then an item was put in to pay that claim after it had gone through three courts, judgment being given. I think, in every court unanimously. But a terrible row was raised because this was put in the Supplementary Estimates. When it was raised, I withdrew the estimate because there was an allegation of wrongdoing. I promised an investigation and appointed a judge to investigate, and then those who raised the row ran away and declined to give any evidence. Here are three cases that have not been proven, that are simply being paid out of the public treasury without any attempt to establish them before courts of law.

Mr. SHAW: I think the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is reasonable. I understand from the minister that this claim of the contractor mentioned for this particular sum rests only on a verbal contract. That is a rather strange thing at the outset. It seems to me it is only reasonable that he should be asked to prove his claim in a court of law, and then the country would be justified in paying it. Short of that, I must oppose the item.

Mr. GRAHAM: I explained fully to the committee that as a matter of law—the hon. member as a lawyer would raise the point—if that were upheld, many claims that are settled could not be settled in court, and technically that is not the ground on which I put this thing. The hon. member would know that in a court of law, under this contract there would be no case. I pointed that out. I know if Mr. Cochrane were alive this question would not be asked and the claim would be paid. I have not the file as I sent it to my hon. friend, but on the file there is a long affidavit from Mr. Roger Miller pointing out how he undertook this work; that he was sent for and asked to undertake it under those conditions. He makes an affidavit to that whole statement and we owe him the money just as much as I should owe a board-bill if I stayed at an hotel.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend (Mr Shaw) is a lawyer of years' standing and he knows that often a person is unable to go to court because there is no written memorandum in reference to the contract. There might be a perfectly good verbal contract that could not be enforceable at law but there would be a claim in equity. My hon. friend knows that in many cases no action can be brought unless a note or a memorandum signed by the party can be produced. Nevertheless there is recourse in equity. As I understand the situation, the minister is not taking advantage of a technical objection, but is accepting what in equity would be a claim of contract.

Mr. SHAW: I am not suggesting for a moment that the statute of frauds should be raised in defence of this action; the minister need not raise that defence unless he wants to. Certainly it should be established to the satisfaction of the court that there had been made some sort of verbal contract or arrangement. The mere affidavit of the individual should not be sufficient for the purpose in a matter of this kind, however reputable he may be. Let the finding of the court on that issue be the determining factor, and in addition let the court ascertain the exact amount due.

Mr. MARTELL: Whether there is a verbal contract or not—

Mr. BUREAU: This is not a court of law.

Mr. MARTELL: —in many instances no case can lie unless there is a note or a memorandum producible.

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend is mistaken in his law. The statute must be pleaded before it is taken advantage of.

Mr. BUREAU: Why argue points of law here?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a report from the chief engineer—

Mr. GRAHAM: I quoted it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —dated April 30th, 1919. It reads:

It is true that in connection with this work there existed some unusual hazards, but the contractor is in error in implying that the department encouraged tenderers to accept the hazards at a lower cost than was warranted.

The whole claim was that he was coaxed into it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not use the word "coax."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The report goes on:

These hazards like all other parts of the work were subject to competitive tender and a comparison of the bids received shows that the bid of the Roger Miller & Company anticipated the risks that would be encountered.

There were three offers.

Mr. GRAHAM: And this was the lowest.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The chief engineer states further:

During the progress of the work, certain changes were made which necessitated the construction of an additional piece of cribwork. This was ordered and paid for on the basis of cost plus 10 per cent as provided for in the contract. Such payment to the contractor for this additional piece of cribwork does not involve us in any liability for the cribwork constructed under the lump sum in the contractor's tender. The claim presented for the contractors by the Hon. Charles Murphy cannot be entertained as a claim under the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what I said.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It appears that in 1919 the claim was not admitted.

Mr. BUREAU: Under the contract. My hon. friend is basing his argument on the legal right of the man under the contract. The minister has explained that such is not the view that is taken of the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend desires to discuss that phase of the question I think I can with perfect justice claim that apparently the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) has more influence today with the present government than he had with the last one.

Mr. BUREAU: That would be a fair insinuation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Here is the claim presented and here is the report of the engineer. This is all I have been able so far to glean from this exhaustive file. If the government are determined to press the matter through without our knowing anything about it I will not hold them up. It is idle to talk about postponing it until Tuesday; it is not fair to hon. members, and I do not think they should be detained when it is evident that the government are determined to put the thing through. Will the government concede this much? Will they decide to take no action on this vote until we have had some opportunity of going through the files and of satisfying ourselves as to the fairness of the transaction?

Mr. BUREAU: That is childish. The government is responsible.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am submitting a perfectly fair offer.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member is not. Never in his time did we ever ask that the government should not assume responsibility for anything of this kind. We never asked that we be allowed to decide.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In our time reckless charges of graft were made and the government promptly withdrew the item. If my hon. friend is referring to us to support his contention then he should withdraw this item.

Mr. BUREAU: We never asked that we should be the judges of what should go through.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We never attempted to push things through.

Mr. BUREAU: You probably felt guilty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I am not to have an opportunity of reading this file?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are some 200 pages which we are given three minutes to read. If the government are determined to press the matter through, then all I can say is that they will have to take the responsibility.

Item agreed to.

Hudson Bay railway—construction, $350,000.

Mr. KNOX: I am rising not to criticize this vote, because if I had any criticism to

offer it would be that the vote is not as large as it should be. We had hoped that a vote would be brought down which would indicate that something was going to be done towards the completion of this project. However, I feel that the government intends to carry out the statement made in the House when the resolution regarding the Hudson bay project was discussed, that the portion of the line on which steel was laid would be brought up to standard this year. I assume that this is the amount figured on for the work. Am I right in that assumption, and can we rest assured that work will be undertaken in the near future?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot give the assurance that this amount will complete the work we have on hand. That cannot be decided until the engineers are on the line. It might take more, but this is all we can spend this year. My instructions are that the work of reclamation will be proceeded with.

Mr. KNOX: In view of the rumours we have heard to-night in regard to the branch lines in the West, may we take it for granted that there will be plenty of opportunity for men and equipment for this work?

Mr. GRAHAM: I should think so.

Mr. KNOX: We might also hope, I think, for more than the completion of that portion of the line on which steel has been laid being brought up to standard.

Mr. GRAHAM: We can only spend this amount of money.

Mr. MacLAREN: Has this item been recommended by the Canadian National Railway Board?

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount, as I outlined last year, was recommended by the board. About 114 miles of the road have become dilapidated and the board has recommended that that portion be repaired. That is what this money is for.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understand that within the last two years certain of the rails were ordered taken up.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was proposed that some heavy rails should be taken up on this portion of the line, but the line was in such bad shape that they did not even get in to do that.

Mr. CHURCH: The construction of the Hudson Bay railway has been a political proposition from start to finish. I am sorry to say that the two old political parties have had a hand in it, and now the Progressive party is taking part in it as well. Canada has had too many political railways, and before any more money is spent on this project I think an account should be taken. The Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways have not had time to consider this matter, notwithstanding what has been said in that regard. I say this is a political matter and it becomes very active around election time. One reason why the taxes of the working classes have been so heavy is that an extravagant railway policy has been pursued in this country. Before any further expenditure is made on this road the following considerations should receive attention:

1. The navigability of Hudson straits.
2. The probable volume of eastbound and westbound traffic available.
3. Local conditions and prospects for colonization.
4. Operating revenues and expenses.
5. Storage at Hudson bay.
6. The linking up of the Hudson Bay railway with the transportation systems of the West.

The minister should be able to answer these questions before we pass this item. Ontario has a railway similar to this, the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario. They applied to the federal government for a subsidy, and what did the federal government say? They said it was not a work for the general advantage of the Crown as a colonization road, and of Canada. It was looked upon by the officers of the Crown as a colonization road, and Ontario is extending that road right up to James Bay. The condition is the same in Manitoba as respects the Hudson Bay railway; it is a colonization road, and if the federal government has regarded the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario as a colonization road, as a work not for the general advantage of Canada, then the same should apply to the Hudson Bay railway. In the first place, the Hudson bay route will not get the grain trade. I venture to say there are some seasons when the channel there is not open two months in the year. Grain which is sent to the head of the lakes can go out 365 days of the year—in the summer months via the lakes, Buffalo, and the St. Lawreence, and in the winter months via Chicago and New York and Montreal. This route was reported upon by a royal commission appointed by the government of Canada. That commission made a very extensive examination of the feasibility of this project, taking into account all considerations affecting finance, the movement of grain, the probable volume of traffic, and so on. I am sorry the two old political

1 a.m.

parties have not heeded the report of that commission, because it is the report of experts. We have enough deficits to meet now —Grand Trunk, Grand Trunk Pacific, Canadian National. Roads which were built under private ownership have had to be taken over by the people of Canada. Public ownership is not responsible for this condition. Now, let me read one paragraph of the report of this commission, which consisted of the present member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), Mr. W. M. Acworth, and Mr. A. H. Smith, president of the New York Central. It says:

> We understand that construction work on the Hudson bay line has been suspended. We think that the work should not in any case be recommenced till more urgent needs have been met and money is more easily procurable. And if work on the line is begun again, we think it should be done in the most economical manner possible, and only up to the standard of a local line, bearing in mind that it cannot be expected for many years to come to be self-supporting. Considering the small advantage in rail mileage from the grain-growing areas, which the Hudson bay possesses over the existing routes to Port Arthur, and that from many districts it possesses no advantage at all; considering further the short and uncertain period of navigation in the bay, and that grain consigned to port Nelson will consequently always be liable to be detained there for nine months till navigation is again opened; considering that higher ocean freights may be expected to absorb, if not more than absorb, any possible saving in rail rates, we cannot believe that this route will ever secure any serious share in the export trade. Still less can we think that it will handle an import business. Unless considerable mineral wealth should be discovered in the territory which this line will open up, it must we fear, continue to be almost indefinitely a burden upon the people of Canada. And everything that can be done should be done to make this burden as small as possible.

I may say further that since the Hudson straits are open for specially constructed vessels between July first and the end of October, only the crop of the preceding year could be counted on for traffic. A good deal of that traffic would have to be at Port Nelson by the opening of navigation, so that there will have to be immense storage facilities at that point. But who would think it wise to lock up his export wheat at Port Nelson knowing that it could be shipped through only between July first and the end of October? The question answers itself. Now, let me quote further from an article on the subject:

> Wheat is always somebody's property. It moves at the direction of its owner, and the owner wants it where he can be sure of making delivery by a specified date. The very essence of the export wheat business is time of delivery, and it is precisely that condition which, practically every year, from October 20 to December 5, forces nearly 70 per cent of Canadian export wheat out by way of Buffalo and New York, although the St. Lawrence route to Montreal offers from 2 to 5 cents per bushel lower carrying charges. There is nothing more definitely established than that our export wheat does not follow the cheapest channel or shortest channel, all economic theories or assertions to the contrary notwithstanding. It does the reverse, and that astounding fact cannot be ignored in considering the possibility of finding enough traffic to load one train per day, for six months in the year, for Hudson bay. People who merely look at a map and then become dogmatic about transportation have thus far done all the talking about this Hudson Bay railway.

We have wasted money enough on this project, money that the old central provinces have had to pay as well as the rest of Canada. The railways of the United States have also got into a deplorable condition; they have gone on making extensions against the reports of experts. Where is Sir Henry Thornton on this proposition? Has he had a chance in the short time he has been here to go over this district and find out if the route is feasible? Talk about giving the board a free hand, if this is how the government is going to do it I have no hope of the railways being a success. At this late hour I do not wish to detain the committee any longer, but I wish to protest against this expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway. I think it is a waste of money. I think the road will never pay the fixed charges on the investment. Talk about navigation. Why, you have not considered the question of terminals, the type of boats and many other questions from a navigation standpoint. If this road is to be built it should be built by the province of Manitoba just like the province of Ontario built a similar road to James bay.

Mr. MacLAREN: Has the minister the report of the Railway Board on this construction?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is not construction. Although the Hudson Bay railway is under construction, this is not for new construction. As I explained to the House last year, 114 miles of the road already built is being put in operating shape. There is nothing being done in the way of new construction.

Mr. MacLAREN: It says "construction" in the item.

Mr. GRAHAM: The line is under construction until it is completed.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understand that the Railway Board have recommended this construction. May we have their report?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not that report with me. I thought I went into this matter pretty fully last year. Before any further work is done there will be no other reports. The boards, if for no other reason, but this is not my reason, felt that even if only to take out

these rails my hon. friend has spoken of they had to put the road in shape to the end of the steel to bring them out. All that material would be wasted if the road was not put in shape.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister gave the impression when he spoke earlier this session that the decision to take up the rails on the Hudson Bay railway had been made prior to the arrival of Sir Henry Thornton, and that the reversal took place afterwards. I looked over the file immediately afterwards and found that the impression given by that language was entirely wrong. The recommendation of Sir Henry Thornton came to that effect. The recommendation to council, and I think the order in council itself by which the government decided to approve of the taking up the rails includes a reference to Sir Henry Thornton as agreeing thereto.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, it does.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my hon. friend is absolutely wrong, because Sir Henry Thornton was not here at the time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He came here afterwards.

Mr. GRAHAM: My deputy was then acting chairman of the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the file is here I will show the minister. I went into it carefully. I have it upstairs. The government approved of it and the file shows that Sir Henry Thornton approved.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not agree with that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish the minister had the file. I know the impression he gave before, and it was distinctly wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not agree with that either.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not matter whether the minister agrees with it or not. I do not know why the minister is objecting because if he looks at the correspondence he will see what changed the decision of the government. What changed the decision of the government at least, whether it changed the decision of the board or not I will leave hon. members to conjecture, were the appeals and protests from Liberal associations in northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. When they arrived the opinions of both the government and the board changed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to argue with my hon. friend but he is absolutely incorrect as to why the decision was changed.

Mr. HANSON: I want to add my protest against the expenditure of another dollar on the Hudson Bay railway. I want to tell the minister that the whole of eastern Canada is opposed to the expenditure of another dollar on this railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member for Grenville is not.

Mr. HANSON: I cannot help what the hon. member for Grenville thinks. It does not bind my conscience in this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: He represents the East.

Mr. BUREAU: And you cannot bind that of the East.

Mr. HANSON: All the expression we hear from eastern Canada is directly opposed to the expenditure of another dollar on this road, and the government might as well appreciate the force of public opinion in the East on this matter. At this late hour I am not going to say anything more about it, but eastern Canada will vote against this and against any government that spends any money on that road.

Mr. BAXTER: I want to know if this vote is simply an attempt to carry out the pledge given by the Minister of Agriculture in a recent by-election in the West that the Hudson Bay railway would be completed before next Christmas. I agree with the hon. member for York-Sunbury who has just spoken that eastern Canada is absolutely opposed to this railway, and the common sense of all Canada is equally opposed to it. I would say further that I understand, and I am not going to quote my authority, which besides is excellent, that Sir Henry Thornton himself started the operation of taking up the rails on this bit of road, which in my judgment should never have been built as it was nothing but a wildcat enterprise built to satisfy a demand from western Canada, which was absolutely misled as to the purpose that could be served by the construction of this road. Sir Henry Thornton as a railway man started to take up the rails, my informant said, when "they" stopped the operation. When I asked who "they" were I was told, "Oh, there was a Mr. Stewart who was a director." I do not know who he is, but he was a director and was in touch with western interests, and apparently political influence was more powerful than the business aspect of this question. As far as I can see it, with the ice-bound bay, with the shifting sands and the danger of the route, it would be far more sensible to direct the trade of Canada in some other direction. Other parts

of Canada which could be vital to the carrying on of overseas trade are being absolutely neglected, and in the hope of getting somehow or other the support of certain members in this House who never will give their support to either party because they think themselves superior to both, the government is prepared to waste $350,000 more to get that which will never be delivered and they are willing to do it at the expense of all the rest of Canada. I want to put myself and the part of the country from which I come as absolutely and definitely on record against the flagrant misuse of the funds of Canada in building a railway that cannot serve either the farmer or any other interest adequately.

Mr. MacLAREN: Would the minister give the committee an explanation of this point? It was stated that it was the decision of the Railway Board to remove the rails to make use of them in other directions, and a certain number of rails were removed to be used in other portions of the country the view being taken that it was a useless railway. Now the vote here for $350,000 is to restore that railway. What I wished to ask the minister was if he would inform the committee of this change of attitude?

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact the Canadian National Railway Board, with Major Bell in the chair, passed a resolution not to abandon the Hudson Bay railway but to secure these rails for the time that were not being used and use them on branch lines. But when they came to discuss the question practically they found they could not rescue these rails or ties without first virtually reconstructing the road or repairing it for about one hundred and some odd miles. If my hon. friend knew the locality he would understand thoroughly what I mean. Now, even if the road were not to be proceeded with to Nelson or Churchill, this money would have to be expended to put the road in shape out to the end of steel to bring in the material to rescue the rails and ties. I suppose there is a million dollars worth of material there. I am not saying this is to be done, but even if it were to be done this money would have to be expended before a yard of rails could be brought out.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is it proposed to bring any of the rails out after this is done?

Mr. GRAHAM: That will be a matter for further consideration, but at present no. It does not look from what has taken place that we will need them for branch lines in the West.

[Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. MacLAREN: I record my dissent to this vote.

Mr. BAXTER: Did I understand the minister to say that we are asked to vote $350,000 without being assured that it is the government's intention, or the intention of the board that apparently advises the government, to take up the rails, or that this money is not to be spent for the completion of the line? Are we asked as sensible men to vote this money without knowing what we are voting it for? I cannot grasp what is contemplated from the statement of the minister. He says it may be necessary to spend it in order to save another million dollars worth of property and yet he says in the same breath it may be advisable to extend the railway to completion. I cannot follow his statement and I want to know what I am asked to vote this money for. If it is for the completion of the railway I am unalterably against it. It is one of the mad fancies the people of Canada have gone into, and the sooner it is abandoned the better.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is not a dollar of this for the completion of the road.

Mr. BAXTER: What is it for?

Mr. GRAHAM: I pointed out three or four times that for 114 miles the line is absolutely in such a condition that the trestles have rotted down; there has not been anything done on it for years in the way of operation. The first thing the government must do before it can either take out the material or start the completion of the line for the last ninety miles is to put this portion of the line in a state of repair.

Mr. BAXTER: I ask the minister to tell me whether the government have resolved to build the line or take the rails up. I want to know which course they are going to pursue. Surely the people of Canada are entitled to know what is going to be done with their money.

Mr. GRAHAM: If a vote should be asked to complete the line that will be proof that the government intends to do it. This is the commitment the government agreed to last session in this House and that is what this vote is for. Whether the line be completed or not this vote, and more too, will be necessary to put the line in a state of repair that will permit the taking out of the material.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): What is the object of putting this portion of the line in a state of repair if the railway is not to be completed ultimately?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have just given the reason. There is approximately, I am told, a million dollars worth of ties, fish plates, and other material which cannot be brought out unless this road is put into a condition for operating.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Is the vote necessary to complete the line, or is it just to move this material?

Mr. GRAHAM: This vote is necessary no matter what may be done.

Mr. BAXTER: Surely we are not to be asked to vote $350,000 without having a definite statement from the Railway department that they are going to carry the line to completion, or that they are going to take up the rails? Let us know which it is. They must know now which object they are going to carry out, unless we are going to have a repetition of the Hotel Scribe incident in Paris, and the government does not know what is going to be done by superior authority. If we are to be asked for an endorsement by somebody who has not yet indicated his views to the government, tell us even that, but let us know along what line we are asked to vote the money?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have fully informed my hon. friend of the reasons for the vote.

Mr. BAXTER: We have not got any reason yet; I do not know what is going to be done.

Mr. KNOX: I wish to say that I object most strenuously to some of the statements that have been made here by the hon. members for St. John. I think the statements come with a very bad grace from either of these hon. gentlemen considering the amount of money which has been voted for harbours on the Atlantic coast from which we expect to get no revenue whatever. My hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) in his superior way told us this is purely a political matter. I wish to assure him that it is not a political matter in the West; it is a matter of bread and butter to the people out there. Because, unless we will get something that will enable us to get our produce on the markets of the world a little cheaper than we are doing at the present time I do not know what the future of the West is going to be.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will the taking up of these rails help?

Mr. KNOX: We are not taking up the rails.

Mr. BAXTER: The minister will not tell us whether they are being taken up or not; we do not know.

Mr. KNOX: I presume some of my hon. friends to my right would like to see the rails taken up, judging from the way they are talking. I wish to assure them that the West will not stand for anything of the kind.

Mr. BAXTER: Reference has been made to the position of the members for St. John. I think I might point out that the hon. member who has just spoken cannot possibly know from the cryptic utterances of the Minister of Railways whether the rails will be taken up, or whether they will be nailed down. Of course, it is only in keeping with the attitude of his party to which I referred earlier in the day. He is quite prepared, if he thinks he can get anything in the way of expenditure, no matter how useless, that will be directed towards his particular section of the country to follow the government with perhaps the hope of something more tangible than that. But for the rest of us, we want to know most definitely whether these rails are to be taken up, or whether the railway is to be extended. I would not expect a member from the West, that is from the Progressive party, to be at all interested in whether there would be at the end of the railway any machinery by which grain would be taken care of. I would not expect him to care whether it was a single track or a double track railroad. I would not expect him to care anything about the question of a possible congestion of cars at the end of the line. I would not expect him to care anything about the conditions of ice in Hudson bay. From what I have seen during this session I would not expect them to require anything but the expenditure of money in a fanciful attempt to carry out their purpose without regard to the uselessness to Canada of that expenditure. But the rest of us have a different idea. We want to know what is going to be accomplished by this expenditure. We want to know whether the government has decided to take up the rails or not, or whether the government has decided to build this railway to tide water. The hon. member, however, does not care so long as money is spent. The rest of us do care and we want to know what the government proposes to do?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Railways was very direct and not any too considerate in his denial of my statement that

Sir Henry Thornton had agreed with the government's decision to take up the rails, he could scarcely have been more specific than he was. Although some months had elapsed since I had read this I felt sure of my ground, and can as surely confront the minister with a most definite confirmation of what I said. The government's order in council authorizing the taking up of the rails was passed on the 24th November. That order in council cited a report dated 22nd November from the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, representing in connection with the operation of the Hudson Bay railway that the vice-president and general manager of the Canadian National Railways had presented a report relative to the advisability of lifting the rails between miles 214 and 334, consisting of 120 miles of No. 1, eighty-pound rails the same to be used on the main line subdivision between Vermilion and Edmonton to replace sixty pound rails urgently requiring renewal.

There are certain other recitals not necessary to refer to, but this is the end—

> The minister observes that until such time as the financial condition of the country would warrant the completion of the Hudson Bay railway project the using of the lifted rails on another portion of the system would appear to be an economical procedure, as if left where they are they would in short time deteriorate to such an extent as to become of no value.

The preceding paragraph reads:

> The minister, upon the advice of the said board, concurred in by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, accordingly recommends that authority be granted to take up the track on the Hudson Bay railway from mile 214 to mile 334, and to use the material therefrom at such points upon the Canadian National Railways as the said board may deem expedient.

That is the order in council which decided the matter dated 24th November. To be brief, I will pass now to a document which is on the file dated 19th December. This order in council refers to a resolution, a decision, come to by the directors on the 20th October. The directors decided to the 20th October to take up the rails. That was included in a report in November, and the whole thing was given effect to in an order in council dated 24th November. On the 19th December the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals wrote the following letter to James Stewart, who at this time was director of the roads, and who had written the letter protesting against this policy: The letter reads:

> In reply to your letter of the 11th instant, I may state that following meeting held by the Directors of the Canadian National Railways on the 20th October while inspecting the western lines, a communication was addressed to the Acting Minister of Railways, pointing out to him the views expressed by the directors at this meeting, and requesting him to submit the matter to the Governor in Council for approval. This has been done, and an order in council has already been passed, authorizing the Board of Directors to proceed with the taking up of the rails between miles 214 and 334.
>
> Since the arrival of the chairman, Sir Henry Thornton, this matter has been discussed with him at some length, and he has expressed his approval of the action taken by the Board of Directors during his absence. In view of this, I do not see that any good object would be served by having the matter brought up for reconsideration at the present time.

I hope the minister will now accept the situation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I accept it absolutely. My right hon. friend and I were discussing two different things.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend will take an hour to straighten out a thing that needs no straightening. The decision to take up the rails was made before Sir Henry came here. That is what I had in my mind, and I pointed out to him—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said that Sir Henry Thornton had agreed to it, and the minister distinctly contradicted me. That is all there was to it.

Mr. GRAHAM: He would not even let me agree with him if I wanted to. He would interrupt me if I were trying to agree with him. The decision to take up the rails was passed by the board before Sir Henry came here. I never heard anything of this letter between the deputy minister and Mr. Stewart. It never came to me and as far as my connection with it is concerned Sir Henry Thornton was not present when the decision was arrived at. If he agreed to it afterwards that is another thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said he had agreed to it and that is what the minister contradicted. I do not say he knew he was wrong but he should not have contradicted me unless he knew he was right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have had a chance of going through the next file while the matter is being discussed and I think I can tell hon. members what the government's policy is in connection with the Hudson Bay railway because I see that the next item is a refund to J. D. McArthur & Co. of $90,000 and I find from the file that under the contract and the arrangements that money can never be paid him until the railway is completed. I think the minister will agree with me.

Mr. GRAHAM: I could not tell until I had read the file. That is not the way I read it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the road is not to be completed the money can be paid, but if the road is to be constructed the country has no right to give up the $90,000. Mr. McArthur states that the $90,000 is in the hands of the Department of Railways and Canals and is held pending the completion of the Hudson Bay line. I know that. Then I note that he got impatient about it, and made application to the late minister, the Hon. W. C. Kennedy, on August 9, 1922. Mr. Kennedy handed the letter over to the deputy, and this is what Major Bell says:

> Your letter of August 9th to the minister is now before me. With reference to the agreement of the 5th April, 1919, you will note that the use of the word "temporarily" is relevant only to the suspension of the work at the time your contracts were in force. The agreement cancelled these contracts and provided for the retaining of $90,000—
>
> "until such time as His Majesty shall complete the works—".
>
> The word "temporarily" is not found in this latter connection, and I am advised that the time for completion of the work is entirely within the discretion of His Majesty. It is not necessary, nor in order, for me at the present time to deal with the contingency suggested by the expression in your letter—"if the government decides not to proceed with the work at all".
>
> If your legal advisers entertain the opinion that a petition of right to obtain a refund now of the above sum will have any profitable result, this department will not, I apprehend, interpose any objection to the granting of a fiat, but, in the opinion of our legal department, such a proceeding would be absolutely futile. Under clause 8 of the agreement the Exchequer Court would have no jurisdiction, as the chief engineer is the sole arbitrator in all disputes.
>
> In looking upon this $90,000 as an asset to be hypothecated, regard must have been had to the fact that it really was the payment of an estimated loss if the contracts were completed under conditions such as then existing, even though coupled with a prospect of some refund if construction costs were lower at some future time when the government might decide to complete.

The whole thing is that if the man had not been let off his contract he would have lost $90,000. As a matter of fact, I think it would have been more. It is quite obvious that this refund never should be given unless the government has definitely abandoned the Hudson Bay project. If the Hudson Bay railway is to be completed, in granting this refund the government is adding just that much to the cost and the country's expense.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will make a statement of the other side of the case. My hon. friend has a little advantage of me in all these things, because he has the files.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has had them a long time. I have only had a chance to skim over them.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member has done pretty well. This is the situation for the committee to decide. McArthur had a contract to complete the Hudson Bay railway, and the late government had paid him so much money, but retained $90,000 as stated clearly in settlement to pay any loss that might accrue to the government if they proceeded to complete the road. That is, if the government in completing the road were compelled to pay more money than McArthur had contracted to build the road for, this $90,000 was to meet the loss. The engineers, under the estimate of that time, thought the loss could not be more than $90,000. If in completing the road, a greater cost was not incurred than was included in McArthur's contract, the whole $90,000 would come back. As a matter of fact, this $90,000 is McArthur's by the settlement, retained by the government as against the completion of the road. The only question is this: This has been retained for five years, perhaps, nearly six years. Is it fair for the government to sit down and keep McArthur's $90,000 for all eternity? It is his money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that when this road is going to be built?

Mr. GRAHAM: You cannot compare time with eternity. It is his money retained by the government in case loss was incurred in connection with the completion of the contract. We cannot go on with the work this year. It does not look as if it would be gone on with next year. How long should the country retain this $90,000 belonging to McArthur? If the committee thinks five years is not long enough, my opinion is that if this had been a matter between private individuals, this $90,000 would have been handed back to him. When the matter comes up again, the contract will be made under new conditions and new terms; a new contract will be entered into. McArthur cannot get the money unless we vote it for him; but it is his money, as I say, retained by the government. Does the committee think it is time to give him back his $90,000?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not quite the way in which the matter should be put.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the right way? I want to be fair about it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In 1919 he wanted to get rid of his contract and he got a good, big settlement. He got a just settlement. He got a settlement which he should be absolutely satisfied with.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Was Mr. McArthur prepared to go on with the contract, or did the government stop it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He certainly did not want to go on.

Mr. GRAHAM: Did the government not stop the contract?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The deputy is there and he can give the minister the information.

Mr. GRAHAM: The deputy informs me that the work was stopped earlier than this time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly, and I think the deputy will say something else too.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. member has not answered the question. Did the government not stop the contract?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am trying to get the information from the minister.

The CHAIRMAN: The item before the committee is the Hudson Bay railway construction, and the discussion is proceeding in connection with the McArthur claim.

Mr. GRAHAM: We can pass the other one if the committee is willing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All right.

Mr. BIRD: No. I do not wish to detain the House more than a few minutes, but I desire to add a word of protest to those uttered by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) against the spirit of opposition manifested towards this western aspiration by one or two hon. members to our right. I trust that spirit is not widely shared by the members in any corner of this House. It would be very regrettable if a spirit of that kind prevailed in this House. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) seems to be obsessed by twin antipathies, one to the Progressive party and the other to the western part of Canada. Usually his judgment is to be relied upon. When his mind is working in a sphere with which it is familiar, we delight to listen to his utterances; but when he is under the influence of those pet aversions of his, his judgment seems to wander far from sound logic. I want to say, as I have tried to say before in this House, that the Hudson Bay railway transcends a mere political matter. It is an aspiration of the West and of the whole of the West. When hon. members stand up and say with superficial finality that the East will not do this and the East will not do the other, we can do what we regret to do, what we think it is always inadvisable to do, we can stand up and say that the West will do this and the West will do the other. That is a spirit that ought not to be engendered in this House by responsible members. It is a spirit that ought to be avoided if possible. Where will this Dominion arrive at if hon. members deliberately on every occasion take the opportunity to stir up that kind of spirit of blind, unreasoning opposition between one part of Canada and another? I would not mind, no hon. member would mind, if that kind of thing was supported by facts and reasons; but the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) have had ample opportunity in this House to array their facts upon this question, to stand up in a reasonable manner and to meet argument with argument previously in this session and in the last session. Did they do that? At this moment, in a totally unsupported manner, without a single fact, without the least suspicion of acquaintance with the facts, they stand up and deliberately tell this House and the West that the East is forever and for all time opposed to this aspiration of western Canada. One trembles almost to think what the repercussion in western Canada will be of a recent act of the Senior Chamber of this parliament. We want to know how far responsible statesmen in this country are going to go with matters of that kind. If some of these hon. members were a little better acquainted with the sentiment that prevails in western Canada, they would be a little more careful before adding fuel to fires that are already burning pretty briskly. Hon. members will stand up and proclaim their love for this wide Dominion of ours, speaking in superlatives, and yet when it comes to practical matters wherein all the sympathies of all parts of Canada may be legitimately sought these men will deliberately try to drive in the wedge and make it impossible for the country to work harmoniously and in a practical way I would advise these gentlemen to make their patriotism a little more practical. Let them use their imaginations in trying to visualize what the future of Canada can only hold if the communities in all parts of the country will co-operate under some form of reasonable compromise.

The CHAIRMAN: I would recall the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he has already dealt rather fully with the question of the failure of certain hon. members to appreciate certain things. There is a definite item before the committee, however, and I would ask him to confine his remarks thereto.

Mr. BIRD: The item is an important one, but the issue raised by the hon. gentleman to my right is of still greater importance.

The CHAIRMAN: It does not happen however to be the item before the committee. The hon. member must confine his remarks to the subject matter under discussion.

Mr. BIRD: Perhaps I am taking hon. gentlemen too seriously.

An hon. MEMBER: You certainly are.

Mr. BIRD: If that is the feeling of the committee I am prepared to let the matter go so far as that particular aspect of it is concerned. With regard to the vote itself, what is provided now is a very small start, but I must be grateful for small mercies. I cannot understand just how this $350,000 is going to put that 300 miles of line into anything like its original condition. I understand the minister to say that it is to be applied to the northern 100 miles, but I gathered from the deputation that was down here some weeks ago that the whole of the line was in very bad repair. The first 200 miles, although it had been in partial operation some time, appeared to be in very poor condition, and if that is the case I can see that this $350,000 will not go very far.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does the hon. member not think that $350,000 is sufficient for the purpose of taking up the rails?

Mr. BIRD: So far as I can understand, the question is not of taking up but of putting down rails, or rather of repairing the rails that already exist. Now this should not be a political matter but it seems to me that there is a strong attempt being made to use it for political purposes. With regard to the original intention of the board to take up these rails, it was by accident that I was instrumental in making that fact generally known to the public, and from the knowledge I have of the circumstances I am of the opinion that Sir Henry Thornton's acquaintance with the question was subsequent to the action of the board. Even if he did approve of the board's action, that can be easily explained. Sir Henry Thornton was newly arrived in this country, and he would naturally know little of the necessities of western Canada; and had he been here before and been acquainted with the conditions that have existed so long it is inconceivable to me that he would have approved of that action of the board, which I will not begin to explain. I am not going to offer any criticism; probably the board considered themselves justified. No doubt the desire was to get out the material; and so far as my knowledge goes, whenever Sir Henry Thornton knew the state of public opinion in the West concerning this matter he must immediately have disapproved of what had been done. Has the minister any expert advice as to what this amount of money will accomplish, and to what extent this 300 miles will be restored to its original condition? This is an important question and it would be useless spending all this money on the last 100 miles if the first 200 miles, which constitutes the most useful part of the line, is to be given no attention.

Mr. GRAHAM: The first 185—not 200—miles is occasionally operated. As regards the condition of the line beyond that, no statement can be made until the engineers are on the ground. This $350,000, as I explained at the outset, will not put the entire line in proper condition, but it is all we can spend just now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to make a single reference to one statement of the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) with regard to the responsibility of another Chamber concerning the Branch Lines Bill. The hon. member would know, if he had read the addresses, that all that has to be done if the government really want to go on with the branch lines is for them to add to the estimates already here such an amount as it deems sufficient, and no hon. members, at all events on one side of the Senate, would have the least objection to accepting it, and certainly none in this House.

Item agreed to.

Refund to J. D. McArthur & Co., $90,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) asked me a question, but I see he is not in the House. Let me read from a letter on the file. It was written in September 1918 from McArthur to the Minister of Railways and it shows how the matter in question came about:

> As you are aware, it is impossible, owing to war conditions, to proceed at present to build at schedule prices the Hudson Bay railway referred to in contracts between myself and the Dominion.

Then he states what is being done. In September, 1918, the man found that he could not go on with the contract owing to increased prices. About that time, perhaps a little later, the government had on hand of his moneys $400,000 odd. They let him out of his responsibilities; they merely held back $90,000 as against the losses which they will have when they come to build the line. I think the

deputy would tell his minister, if his memory is at all good—and I think it is—that Mr. McArthur at that time was very much pleased to receive the money; that it was a very good settlement. He has no right to this now at all. There is the deputy's letter of only last year, there is the action of Hon. Mr. Kennedy only last year. It is absurd to bring down in a supplemental estimate a claim like this: Surely the government do not want to put themselves in the position of forcing a thing like this through at the present stage of the session. It is idle to say that the government will only have the House sit when hon. members want to sit; that is nonsense, piffle of the purest kind. The government know that hon. members want to get away. They know that members have made their arrangements. They know it is wrong to keep this House sitting longer. It is a first-rate foundation for a reputation of forcing through in the dying days of the session—yes, in the dying seconds of the session—claims, settlements which have no basis in law, which have stood for years, and of forcing them through in this way because it is the only way of getting them through.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no desire to do that at all. I have sat up until four or five o'clock in the morning when Sir Robert Borden's estimates were being put through and when there would be only three or four members behind me—sat up two nights before the closing of the session—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not object to that at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then why make a fuss about it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is nothing to be accomplished by misrepresenting my position. I am objecting because this is not a proper vote to be considered in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not much objection to what my hon. friend says about the contract. The only question is that they made a contract, McArthur accepted it, they kept $90,000 of his money—have we kept it long enough? An arrangement of that kind would not be tolerated five minutes between men in business.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, the claim would not be tolerated.

Mr. GRAHAM: Ninety thousand dollars was to be handed back when there was no work being done and no prospect of it in the immediate future. Contracts must be construed in the light of reason. Is five years a sufficient time to withhold a man's drawback as against some loss you may make in construction when there is not even a proposal before the House to build the road?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The order in council went through in 1919. When my hon. friend says it is five years he is a year previous.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is strange that this is just the right time to decide that the $90,000 is to go to Mr. McArthur. Why is it not in the Main Estimates this year? Why can it not be held over for the Main Estimates of next year? This kind of estimate should not be in the Supplementaries which are considered in the last few days of the session, and the minister knows it. Let him wait and just see what investigation reveals. Let him wait and see what will be said about this vote if it appears in the Main Estimates when hon. members will have a real opportunity, as he knows they have not now, to look into it and discuss it. Let the minister hold this one as the one was held at the end of the session of 1921; let him have an investigation—and I will guarantee we will not run away from it.

Mr. SHAW: If I understand the arrangements correctly, the $90,000 is held by the government against any possible loss when the line is completed. That is the definite arrangement between the government and Mr. McArthur and it seems to me the first thing for the government to do is to determine whether or not they are going to build the railway, and then, in the light of that fact, make the arrangements with Mr. McArthur. I do not think Mr. McArthur is entitled to the money under the circumstances; the people of Canada should hold it against any possible loss that may be incurred in the completion of the railway. If the government had decided not to build the railway, then it would be proper to consider whether or not the money should be returned, but that not having been decided, I say there is no reason why the right of the people of Canada to any portion of that money should be forfeited.

Item agreed to: Yeas, 40; Nays, 24.

Welland canal—Port Colborne elevator—extension, $350,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Why has it been necessary to bring this item down in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM: We appointed a committee consisting of the manager of the Montreal Harbour Commission, Mr. Smith, the manager

of the Grand Trunk elevators, and Mr. Henry, to make an investigation as to the whole situation. They brought in a report after the Main Estimates were down. It is very urgent to get this elevator in use if possible this season.

Item agreed to.

To provide for full and final settlement of claim of Telesphore Paradis, $15,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many more ancient claims have we got?

Mr. GRAHAM: A settlement of this claim has been offered for years. Dr. Reid offered to put in the estimates $17,500, but Mr. Paradis refused to take it and continued pressing his claim. I propose to offer him $15,000, and if he does not accept it the item will never appear again.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the claim for?

Mr. GRAHAM: He claims a loss of $57,000 through sparks from an Intercolonial railway engine burning his property.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many years ago?

Mr. GRAHAM: Quite a number. All the ministers have made him offers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the older the claim the more reason for a supplementary.

Item agreed to.

Rideau canal—improvements—repairs and replacement of dams—claims, $9,036.62.

Mr. SHAW: I understand from remarks made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) last year that it was necessary for the government to maintain this canal on account of some arrangement made with the Imperial government at the time it was built. I suggest on account of the more or less uselessness of this canal the Prime Minister when in England this year should endeavour to have this arrangement terminated so that the liability of the country will be thereby lessened.

Mr. GRAHAM: He will have a nice time doing it.

Item agreed to.

Trent canal—improvements—roadway north of Buckhorn lock, $4,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: As I have not had an opportunity earlier this session I might on this item, as it is for a roadway, bring to the attention of the minister and the House the needs of a town known as Depot Harbour, which is the terminus of the Ottawa line, the old Canada Atlantic. This town is situated on an island, an Indian reserve. It has no connection with the mainland and these people are absolutely isolated. It has a population of from 1,000 to 1,500. The engineer of the department has made an estimate of the cost to provide a short roadway one and a half miles long to connect with the mainland. The difficulty in the past has been that the Ontario government had no right to build a road this being an Indian reserve, and there is no authority for the building of it except by the Railway department. While it was under the jurisdiction of the Grand Trunk Railway we had a difficulty in another way, but now that the government has taken over the Grand Trunk I think there is absolutely no justification for withholding a small grant for this purpose in order to give these people access to the outer world. It is not a boomer town; many of the inhabitants have resided there for many years. Many of them have to send their children forty or fifty miles to a continuation school, whereas if we had a road they would have only a very short distance to travel. This matter has been brought to the attention of the department, and I am only repeating now what I have said before in order to impress it on the minister. I trust that before another session a grant will be made to give these people some relief. It would be justifiable in every way.

Item agreed to.

Governor General's cars—repairs, $40,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like some explanation of this item. In the Main Estimates there was a vote of $10,000 for repairing the Governor General's cars. I cannot conceive at all what this item may involve.

Mr. GRAHAM: The other item was for ordinary repairs to these cars, Two cars had to be repaired, but as a matter of fact, when they came to be stripped at the shop it was found that a great part of them had to be absolutely rebuilt and steel under-frames put in. That accounts for this estimate, which I admit is a very large sum.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are these railway cars?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and Inspections—railways—including expenses of Advisory Fuel Committee—additional amount required, $5,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask what amount of this is attributable to the expenses of the Advisory Fuel Committee?

Mr. GRAHAM: One cannot tell just what their expenses will be, as it depends on what travelling they will have to do. Last year they did very important work, and did it very quietly and unostentatiously. Mr. Magrath and Mr. McCourt made many trips to Washington and other parts of the States trying to protect Canadians against a coal shortage, and they succeeded admirably. They work for nothing. This is merely to provide for their expenses. If they do not travel the money is not used. They would not accept any remuneration whatever.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to take the opportunity on this item of making a few remarks with regard to that very question. I am more convinced than I was even before the Fuel Committee took up the question of Canada's fuel supply, that this is a national question of practically the first importance. At the present time we find that the American anthracite supply is rapidly running out. It will run out within man's age at the rate it is now being used. The visible supply of anthracite in Wales is reduced to a very low amount, about 5,000,000 tons a year. Over half of this amount is at the present time consumed by Great Britain, and the balance goes to Norway, Holland and to some extent Denmark. We can never rely upon even Welsh coal for an adequate supply of fuel. We cannot rely on Pennsylvania coal in the future for very long, and the time has come when this country must turn its attention towards the establishment of an all-Canadian fuel supply. That ought to be the aspiration of hon. members of this House who are true Canadians, as I hope we all are, to develop the hope of an all-Canadian fuel supply. Few hon. gentlemen can conceive the vast amount of money we are spending in the United States annually for coal. In the last ten years we spent $580,000,000 or a little better than that in the United States for coal. Had that amount of Canadian money been spent in this country one does not need to exert his imagination very much to see what the result would be. We have in the province of Alberta, it is estimated, over 17 per cent of the world's total coal supply. Great Britain, famous for many years as one of the greatest coal producing countries in the world, has only 5 per cent, and that will perhaps give Canadians some conception of the potentialities of our coal supply. We have recently established definitely that in the northwest portion of the province there is an area of 100 square miles of almost exposed semi-anthracite higher in heating value than the Pennsylvania anthracite, and 80 miles of road would bring that into the markets of the Pacific and possibly as far east as Winnipeg. We have in that deposit of coal the power to practically control the coal supply of the west coast. We have in that portion of the country every known form of coal adaptable for every known purpose, domestic, industrial and shipping. We could coal every boat on the Pacific ocean and every householder from the Yukon to San Francisco, and it is a practical proposition. It would be a national question to open up these coal fields and develop them as a national industry, and I submit that it is in the interest of Canada that that should be done as speedily as possible.

Many recommendations have been made by the Advisory Fuel Board whose estimate we are considering. Some of them are of great value and some of minor value. The one of greatest value I think is that our attention should be turned to the solution of our transportation problem in connection with the coal supply. There is no coal problem in Canada. We have so much coal that one cannot form an adequate conception of it. Think of it—1,234,269 millions of metric tons. That is the calculated coal resources of Canada. I hope hon. members will realize from the little picture I have given the necessity of solving the transportation problem. We have the coal and all we need is transportation, and that problem we must solve. I hope the government will digest the report that was made by the Fuel committee the other day, and just here I want to pay a tribute to the excellent way in which the chairman conducted that committee, and to his extreme courtesy to both witnesses and members. I hope the government will take that report into very serious consideration, and more than that, put into active practice the recommendations of that committee.

Item agreed to.

To increase the amount of loan authorized by vote 139, Main Estimates, 1923-24—additional amount required, $1,550,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is this to cover.

Mr. GRAHAM: This covers 25 per cent of the cost of 2,000 freight cars.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see. This is in connection with the equipment that has been ordered?

Mr. GRAHAM: For equipment required by the board. There was a vote in the Main

Estimates but the board decided it needed more two or three weeks ago and made the request.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the total amount of equipment bought this year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I gave that in a general statement I brought down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have trouble in getting complete statements.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I laid a statement on the Table the other day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I got a statement from the minister the other day and I wrote him this letter on 15th June, that is fourteen days ago:

Dear Mr. Minister,

I have perused the statements supplementary to statement No. 1 set out on page 3790 and following pages in Hansard. In the main statement you have given the headings or grouping of the vote, but it does not appear that proper details have been given in the supplementary statement. Take for example, in item (e),—

Mr. GRAHAM: What are you reading from?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am reading from a letter written to you on the 15th June.

Take for example, in item (e), estimates for construction and betterments, Canadian Northern Railway system. The vote for western lines is $3,355,432, for eastern lines, $1,650,000, and special items $766,262.33. Electric lines, $950,000. No information whatever is given as to what construction is to be made on the one hand and betterments on the other. The items are left mixed up.

What I wanted were particulars showing where the money is going to be spent, where the new construction would take place. Under this heading lands required for construction purposes could be included. There is nothing whatever to show how much of this vote is for land and where the land is.

The House has no idea what it is doing.

The particulars should indicate where the lands required are situated and what vote is asked for each parcel. The ordinary details supplied to you as Minister of Railways should give full particulars.

My hon. friend was very angry with me the other day when he said that no one before had been asked—

Mr. GRAHAM: Never.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —to table his little black book.

Mr. GRAHAM: Never.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said I only did it to save the hon. gentleman's time. I pointed out to him at that time that I had written for this information. I have not yet got it.

Why are these not submitted, and if insufficient, accompanied by proper details? Is parliament not entitled to the full information as to where the money it votes will be applied?

I have not gone over the other items of the statement in detail, but what I have already said will indicate what is required, having regard to all the different items.

Of course I have had no answer. I do not know yet what lands were covered by this grant. My hon. friend may know whether the lands bought in Toronto are covered by this grant.

Mr. GRAHAM: The matter is in the Exchequer Court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Exchequer Court does not give the money.

Mr. GRAHAM: The details are given. I think the money is paid out of consolidated revenue fund.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But the payments should be voted.

Mr. GRAHAM: They should be voted after the payments are made. I think the Exchequer Court payments are made out of the consolidated revenue fund and then an estimate is brought down to cover them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Have the payments been made?

Mr. GRAHAM: The transaction is not completed yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I suppose we will be told about that next year; we shall get the details then. Now, this $1,500,000 is for the 2,000 cars is it?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, it is 25 per cent of the cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Twenty-five per cent for 2,000 cars?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of cars?

Mr. GRAHAM: One thousand automobile cars and a thousand freight cars.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where have they been ordered?

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine they have not been ordered yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is it proposed to order them?

Mr. GRAHAM: Tenders will be called for in the usual way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend does not know his deputy may be able to tell me, whether it is in Canada or the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM: They are going to be ordered in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All of them are to be ordered in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think there is any question of buying them anywhere else.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A considerable proportion of others were ordered in the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is trying to leave a wrong impression altogether. The Canadian National Railway Board advertises for tenders, but my hon. friend is endeavouring to lead the committee to think that Canadian money is going to buy American cars. Now, as a matter of fact, the Canadian National Railways have a big mileage in the United States and it would be reasonable to buy a proportion of their equipment in that country for some of our railways are there. That is all that is being done. I do not think the system could be carried on otherwise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know what my hon. friend is talking about. I was simply asking whether he was buying cars in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend said "I know some of the others were bought in the United States" endeavouring to create a wrong impression.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many were bought in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM: I gave the whole list the other day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Purchased where?

Mr. GRAHAM: I gave a return of the equipment bought since October.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Purchased where?

Mr. GRAHAM: I brought down a statement showing where they were purchased and the price paid. All that information was put on the Table.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would ever get round to giving me this information. I suppose I may hope to get it some time after the House is closed.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, without telling any tales out of school, I have never seen the letter my hon. friend read. It was passed on to the department for answer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if my hon. friend is blaming me for that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When I mentioned it the other day my hon. friend knew about it.

Mr. GRAHAM: This information will be given to my hon. friend as soon as we get it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When it is no good.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say when it is no good. Information is good at any time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to ask the government, through the minister, if they would consider increasing this vote to meet the requirements for branch lines in western Canada? There is a grave suspicion in this part of the House—nay more than a suspicion—that the Railway Bill recently passed forward from this House has been hoisted into the ethereal regions through the process known as the six months' hoist.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have no information on the subject from the other House as yet, I suppose I shall get it later on in the morning.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister have any objection to holding this item over? If he wants any more specific information we have very good ground for believing that the bill has been destroyed. I think in the interests of western Canada some arrangements should be made by this government to take care of the requirements there. It is an intensely serious problem. I do not intend to go into the matter in detail, but I tell you that the future of this country depends entirely on what action may be taken by the government in this matter. The people out there are not going to stand for this very much longer. There is a very grave and serious condition arising. There have been several cumulative instances of it towards the end of this session, and the government is not doing anything to lessen this condition.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would not have anything to do with this vote. You cannot increase the vote. You can bring in other votes and estimates at some other time, but the committee has not power to increase the vote.

Mr. GARLAND Bow River): I am under the impression the government has the power

to increase the vote when it wishes to, and if the government is sincere and earnest in this matter, if it really wishes to give the western lines which it knows are needed, this is the opportunity of doing it. I suggest the item stand till the government has the information it requires.

Mr. GRAHAM. That has not anything to do with this vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All that is necessary is to increase this item 139, simply to bring down a slip of paper similar to the one the government brought down yesterday afternoon, with as many words as there are here in this item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is a different thing. You require to bring down a further estimate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I am seeking to explain.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You want to amend this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am trying to make this clear. It cannot be added to this item, but all the government has to do is to bring down the slip of paper similar to the one brought down yesterday. It is quite clear this is the proper course to pursue if the government wants to go ahead with the work. Here is an item for the purpose of equipment, $25,000. The balance will be by an equipment trust bond which the government guarantees. Why should the $25,000 be here and the rest never appear in the estimates at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The hon. member knows why.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why. If the hon. member thinks he can elighten us, let him do so. Item 139 appears on page 31 of the estimates and it covers about a page, and it reads:

Amount not exceeding $73,000,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating earnings may be insufficient by or on behalf of the Canadian National Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company", or any Company specified in the first schedule to the act incorporating the Canadian National Railway Company, being chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by the Company in respect of any railways, properties or works entrusted to the Company from time to time under the provisions of section 11 of the said chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by or on behalf of any Company specified or referred to in chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1920; or any one or more of them, on any of the following accounts:—

(a) Operating deficits whenever incurred or ascertained.

(b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies.

(c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations.

(d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured, loans secured or unsecured.

(e) Construction and betterments.

(f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities.

(g) Guarantees of securities.

Then it goes over on the next page and reads:

The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council:

(a) To meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred by the Company in respect of railways, properties and works entrusted to the Company as aforesaid.

(b) By way of loans in cash, or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other, subject, however, as follows:

If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, from time to time, payable half-yearly, secured if and when directed by the Governor in Council by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties, in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve.

If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said Companies specified by the Governor in Council, and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto.

Consequently this covers loans and guarantees for all these purposes, including construction of the Canadian National railway. Therefore, all the government needs to do is to bring down an estimate, which it can do in a few hours, and just simply add what it wants for construction purposes. The government knows that the severest attack on its own conduct comes from its own friends.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the hon. member be willing to support such an amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; as to the action of the other House there is no question whatever judging from the speeches made there.

Mr. GRAHAM: We must not discuss the other House. The hon. member says the only reason they did not pass the other bill was because it was not brought down in the way he thought it should be brought down. If he says this item is not in proper form—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I say it is the right form and in the form in which the other should be put. Why should a quarter of the vote for equipment be put in the estimates and not the balances? Because the equipment vote covers both. The whole thing should be there. There should be no bill to osten-

sibly authorize the guarantee of the balance of the equipment, but really to enable the government to do it without bringing it into this estimate, because if the government simply added this to the estimates the other three-quarters, as well as the quarter, then it would be enabled to guarantee the three-quarters under the provisions of the last quarter of the estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member brought it down this way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. we brought down the amounts.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend on December 1st 1919, though the act was passed on June 6th, 1919, issued bonds for $7,500,000 not in the estimates. The balance is in the estimates. Then on May 1st, 1920, bonds were issued for $15,000,000, not in the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were those bonds guaranteed by the government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think they were.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why would it be in the estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM: How is the government going to guarantee these equipment bonds? As I understand it, the Finance Minister had no authority under the act to guarantee equipment bonds.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no objection in the world to giving him authority but I object to having out of the estimates any comitment in relation to our railways. When these bonds were issued they were not guaranteed by the government.

Mr. FIELDING: Were they not obligations chargeable on the country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, they were not obligations on the treasury of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: The treasury of Canada is responsible for every obligation now issued by the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister had thought for a moment, he would not have made that statement. The treasury of Canada is not responsible in relation to bonds it does not guarantee.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, it is responsible for any securities issued by the Canadian National Railway Company, whether guaranteed or not.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The company is responsible.

Mr. FIELDING: Who are the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We own the stock of the railway. The minister is trying to confuse the stock of the company with ownership. It is true we have to protect it in order to protect our stock but nobody would suggest that there would be anything in the estimates unless the treasury were directly bound. They know they cannot confuse me on the matter and they should not try to confuse the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend should not try to confuse anybody else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never try to confuse anyone.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not me in particular. As a matter of fact, this estimate is exactly according to the method adopted by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is perfectly right. I am not objecting to it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, and my right hon. friend said twice: "Why should you not put the whole amount in the estimate?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: If you are guaranteeing it, yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The government has no right to guarantee it. Does my right hon. friend say that we have the right to guarantee the bonds?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the government have not, let them put their bill through to give them the power.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not discussing that. This estimate is inserted in exactly the same way as my hon. friend inserted it in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did not guarantee the bonds.

Mr. GRAHAM. Our legal adviser says that we have no right to guarantee equipment bonds.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend is preventing the bill from going through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not. I am only preventing that feature of it in which an effort is made to escape the responsibility of putting the amount in the estimate.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend's friends in another place—I must not mention it—denounced the passage of the bill of the Minister of Finance just as they are denouncing the

other bill, and it will probably meet the same fate if it ever gets there. At the present moment that bill is not through; there is no power to guarantee the equipment bonds, and we are advised under those conditions that this estimate is in the same position as the estimate put through by my right hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How have we been guaranteeing bonds for the last three years?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not for equipment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: None of them?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We bought some equipment two or three years ago. Does my hon. friend say that there was no guarantee at all?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not on equipment bonds.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why does he make a distinction between equipment bonds and the other bonds? We guarantee the other bonds all right.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are advised that the law makes a difference; that we have not any authority.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be until the hour when the bill goes through which gives the power to guarantee. While I do not think it is a fact, it may be that they have not the power. But the government knows all it has to do is to strip from that bill as from the construction bill the clause which enables them to escape the responsibility of putting the amount in the estimates, and they will both go through without the least difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM: How does my hon. friend know that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it just the way the minister knows it.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, the Upper Chamber objects to many of the lines on the ground that they are not needed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were chiefly of a minor character.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have been endeavouring for some time to call the attention of the committee to a condition that exists with regard to equipment on the government roads and which, I think, might obviate the necessity of building so many cars. I believe there is an arrangement between the railroads of Canada and the United States that if either retain cars of the other beyond a certain number of days, they pay one dollar rental a day for those cars. I think this is a very unwise arrangement for Canada for this reason: In a time of congestion when freight cars are badly needed, they are worth more than a dollar a day. During the season we are shipping a large amount of produce to the United States, and they retain our cars while the rush is on. I may be wrong in this, and if so I am subject to correction. I understand they are able to retain them by paying a dollar a day rent for them. I think our railroads realize that this is no rental for a car, because if a Canadian occupies more than the 48 hours which is allowed for either unloading or loading a car, he is charged demurrage of one dollar for the first day, two dollars for the second day, and five dollars a day after that. If some such arrangement as this were made with the United States, they would return our cars much more promptly. I am informed on very good authority that hundreds, yes thousands of our cars are retained by the United States during the grain-moving period, while our railroads are starved for cars to haul grain.

Mr. GRAHAM: This matter is in charge of the Car Association. There is no way of tracing a car up unless you keep right after it. When a Canadian car gets into the United States, it may be sent as far as possible from home and a dollar a day rental does not make much difference.

Mr. CALDWELL: I realize that in a charge of one dollar a day, there is nothing to induce the railways to send those cars back. I understand this is an international matter. During the grain movement, we send far more cars to United States' ports than we receive, so that they have a great advantage over us. The management of our government railroads would be well advised to endeavour to get some new arrangement in this particular, because this would help us out in the car shortage.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Minister of Railways and the leader of the Opposition have very successfully placed this whole question in a state of confusion so far as I am concerned and, I think, as regards most of the other hon. members, if not all of them. I should like to ask the Minister of Railways if he is willing to seek some properly legal means by which the western lines can be supplied. Is he willing to do something at this session before we prorogue to enable western Canada to get the lines that he acknowledges are required?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a very easy question to ask and a very hard one to answer. The government cannot sit down, and in two or three hours go over the whole system and take a line out that my hon. friend wants and think that will be all right.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister should not make inferences of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will put it on somebody else.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not asking for any particular line.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend should not be so sensitive. I will say some other line. This is a list of 28 lines that have been selected after week after week of study and consideration. The bill, according to reports I have heard, has been kicked out of some other place. We have no right to discuss that; but at this time in the session it is a pretty large order to endeavour to work this out in some other way than the only real practical way there was. I do not intend to be put in the place of so easily doing what people call "passing the buck."

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Personally—and I think I may speak for members in this corner of the House—I think I can say that time is of no object to us in a matter of this importance. We will wait and allow him all the time he wants to bring in the necessary legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About ten seconds would be enough if the will were there. The estimate for the roads in the bill was, I think, $28,000,000. All the minister has to do is to estimate what would be spent the first year. I guarantee that $10,000,000 would cover a good deal more than would probably be completed. All he has to do is to add $10,000,000 to this estimate—that means eight figures—and it is all through. Personally I am in no hurry; I will give him time to write eight figures or eight thousand.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My right hon. friend after arranging with his friends to kill the government measure in regard to the Government railways is endeavouring once more to draw a herring across the trail.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not allow the hon. member to say such things about me. I made no arrangement whatever. Every effort of mine was the other way, and the hon. member knows that too.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not know it.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: All the government has to do is to put the amount in. Let them try that and see if there is any difficulty.

Mr GARLAND (Bow River): I want to have a direct answer from the government in regard to this matter. Perhaps the government would like to have a day or two to consider it, and I would suggest that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no necessity for the item to stand.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the item is going to carry I should like to have an answer.

Mr. CALDWELL: I want to add my voice to what the member for Bow River has said in regard to some method being found of proceeding with the branch lines as proposed by the minister a few days ago. If the bill is not passed by the other Chamber I would strongly urge the minister that he take some definite action in the matter.

Item agreed to.

To provide for surveys and investigation of a railway from a point on the Canadian National railway towards Peace river, $50,000.

Mr. McBRIDE: I think the committee will agree that I have not been taking up the time of the House to any great extent, and in view of that fact I will claim the indulgence of hon. gentlemen for a short time in order that I may place before the government the facts in regard to this item. I have been responsible to a certain extent for having this $50,000 included in the estimates and when I am through, if the committee think that it is not good business to spend the money then I would ask that they vote against it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no objection to it.

Mr. McBRIDE: This is too serious a matter to let slide without informing the House concerning it. I intended explaining this question when the budget was under consideration but I was asked to let it stand until some other time, for the reason that it was desired to take the vote on the budget on the 23rd of May. Now the Peace river country embraces an area of 74,000,000 acres, the greater part of which is good agricultural land. Of this amount 43,000,000 acres are in Alberta and 31,000,000 acres in British Columbia. The Dominion government also owns 3,500,000 on the British Columbia side of the boundary. Some people have stated that the Peace river is a navigable stream. I say it is not; it is a difficult stream to get at. The

banks of the river are from 500 to 1,500 feet high, and even if the river were navigable you cannot get up and down the banks to take anything to the river. In that district there is a water power at Hudson's Hope, which is supposed to be second only to Niagara, and it would be capable of furnishing power for all the trains of the Canadian National railways west of Lucerne. At Findlay Fort, above Hudson's Hope, where some five rivers meet, it has been stated by men who have prospected in the district for many years that if a pulp mill were erected in the locality there is timber enough to supply the mill with pulpwood, enough to turn out 1,000 tons of paper per day for 100 years. This is on the British Columbia side of the boundary. At Hudson's Hope there are to be found some of the best anthracite coal fields in Canada, and the Imperial Oil Company has bored a number of wells and is installing machinery to drill more. I am referring, of course, to the British Columbia side. On the Alberta side there are railway facilities. There is the Edmonton and Dunvegan line which was built by Mr. McArthur and later on taken over by the Alberta government. That line runs about 130 miles north from Edmonton then West to McLellan, a branch of it runs north again from McLellan, crosses the Peace river at Peace river crossing, and extends about 25 miles north of the river. The other branch runs east to Spirit river and there is still another branch running south from Spirit river to Grande Prairie. These lines provide the Alberta side of the Peace river country with a fair railway proposition; it gives ample railway transportation.

It is suggested that a line be run from Brule lake to Grande Prairie, and this is the line to which I want to direct the attention of the government. At Brule lake it would strike the Canadian National line at an elevation of 3,265 feet above the sea level. The Peace river country is from 1,300 to 1,400 feet above sea level, therefore it is obvious that the line would have a heavy grade from the Peace river country up to Brule lake. At Brule lake there are coal mines from which is obtained almost all the coal used by the Canadian National railways west of Edmonton and north of Kamloops. It has been stated that this coal is of first-class quality. That is not correct; only about 20 per cent of it is of first class quality; the rest of it, I should say, is third class quality, although the Canadian National Railways are using it. I might say that before the Canadian National railways were taken over by the government a contract was entered into by the owners of these mines which were directly connected with the railways to supply them with coal for a number of years. That contract, I understand, has not yet expired.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. member that he is very much limited in his discussion of this particular item.

Mr. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I took this matter up with you personally and you practically consented to give me a free hand.

The CHAIRMAN: I could not consent to give the hon. member a free hand. He must keep within the scope of the item.

Mr. McBRIDE: I am dealing with the question before the committee in regard to the extension of the railway from Brule lake to Grande Prairie, and why it is suggested that this line should be built. There were three men around this building lobbying for over three months in connection with this line.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no objection to the vote carrying.

Mr. McBRIDE: But I object to the vote being carried so far as this particular line is concerned. This line is supposed to tap some coal fields about half way between Brule lake and Grande Prairie, and it is suggested that these are the finest coal fields in Canada. Well, I question that for I have it on the authority of men who know these fields that this statement is not correct. It has been stated, and evidence was given to the effect before the committee on Mines and Minerals that these coal fields would look to Vancouver for their market, and the statement was also made that they would give from 3,000 to 4,000 tons a day to the railways to carry. I want to say that they have no market in Vancouver; and will not be able to sell their coal there.

Mr. CARROLL: Why?

Mr. McBRIDE: I will tell you why. I have said that Brule is 3,265 feet above the sea level. In his evidence before the committee Mr. Errington said:

> The market is undoubtedly on the Pacific coast.

Then he was asked:

> I suppose this coal is better than most coal in the West?

He does not answer that question. Then he was asked where he could get a market for it, and he said, the Pacific coast, Vancouver. He was asked how much he expected to get for the coal, and he said $4 or $5 at the mines. He said he would deliver it at Vancouver at $7 per ton. He says in another place in his evidence that the grade going

in there is something the same as the Crowsnest pass. Now if Crowsnest pass has a good grade is the railway prepared to haul the coal at $2 from there to Vancouver? It costs $12 a ton to haul potatoes from Prince George to Vancouver, which is practically the same distance. I will cut that in two and take it at $6 a ton; add $5 to that and the cost in Vancouver would be $11. The Comox coal on Vancouver island is pronounced by the British navy to be the best coal not only in Canada but in the world. According to engineers' report there is enough coal there to last over a hundred years and it can be bought to-day for $8 per ton. Yet these men say they will take that coal from Brule lake to Vancouver and sell it at $7 a ton, whereas at the very least, according to their own figures, it would cost $10 to get it there. How can it compete under those conditions? Not only that, but you can buy oil in Vancouver at $1.25 a barrel, and four barrels of oil are equal to a ton of coal. Three men will do the work of twelve on a steamer when oil is burned instead of coal. Then where is the market for coal out in Vancouver? There is absolutely no market for it, yet these people come down here and want the government to invest $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 in the building of a line to take coal to Vancouver.

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend not think that the propaganda carried on in connection with that road was more on behalf of the wheat interests than of the coal business?

Mr. McBRIDE: Well, I am coming to that. I will admit that if that line was built to Grand Prairie many million bushels of wheat would come out that way. The Grand Prairie district is one of the best mixed farming districts in Canada, but why should this government build a line in there to take the freight away from a railraod that has been built in good faith at the request of the people? What right has this government to tap a country that has been already tapped, when there is another section of this country equally as good without any railway facilities? Some years ago a line was supposed to be built from Vancouver into the Peace river country, known as the Pacific Great Eastern, but that line has practically been abandoned. I would just like the committee to note a few of the grades on that line in order to show that it would not be possible for it to carry grain or anything else out of the Peace river country at a fair rate to the farmer. It starts at North Vancouver and it runs out 12½ miles to White Cliff. Then, because it gets into a difficult country, it skips 29 miles and starts in at Squamish. At Squamish it is on the sea level, but at Alta lake a little distance above Squamish, it rises to a height of 2,100 feet; then it drops down again to 700 feet. Then at Birkenhead it rises to 1,600 feet, and at Lillooet it drops again to 750 feet. Then at Kelly's lake it rises to 3,500 feet and it drops again at Clinton to 3,200. Then it rises again at Horse lake to 3,860 feet and at Quesnel it drops to 1,600 feet. How in the name of common sense could that road ever take grain out of the Peace river country to compete with a line which has a good grade? I am referring now to the Grand Trunk Pacific grade which is the best that can be found on the continent of America. About two years ago the provincial government got an expert engineer, Mr. Sullivan, to examine that railway and report upon it. That was done after they spent $42,000,000 on the Pacific Great Eastern Railway. I will read just a few lines of the engineer's report. Speaking of that portion of the road from Quesnel to Prince George which runs 82 miles south of Prince George, he says:

> I have never before seen such a large area of country so adverse to railway construction and if built the maintenance of this section would be almost prohibitive.

He says further:

> If such conditions had been encountered at the Panama canal I do not think the undertaking would ever have been completed. I therefore recommend that the road between Quesnel and Prince George be abandoned at once and that the tracks be taken up and sold.

I give this simply to show that that line will never be able to take grain out of the Peace river country; it is absolutely beyond reason. If the farmers would charge a sufficient freight rate to justify operation, the people would be prohibited from raising grain in the Peace river country. What I suggest is that there is a line started at Prince George: The highest altitude from Prince George into the Peace river country is less than 2,400 feet. When you leave Prince George if you take the Parsnip river you would be going through good agricultural land practically all the way. If you go through the Pine pass, which is a shorter route, there would be a portion of land that would not be very good for agricultural purposes, but that area extends only about half the way. Now, you may ask: Why start the line at Prince George? Prince George is a divisional point on the Grand Trunk Pacific. It has a population of over 2,000. It is built where

the Fraser and the Nechako rivers meet. It is a good townsite; it has a never-failing supply of water, and there are good routes from there into the Peace river country.

As I have already said, the highest point between Prince George and the Peace river country is 2,400 feet, which would make a very small resisting grade from the Peace river country to Prince George. There you could connect with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it would only be a little over 500 miles from Prince George. In other words, you would bring the Peace river country within about 600 miles of the seaport at Prince Rupert. That would put the Peace river country in a position to raise wheat, and the freight rate would be less than any other section of the prairie. There is nothing to equal it. There are great possibilities in that country—and this government owns three and a half million acres of the land in the Peace river district. Within a few years of this line being built there are possibilities of anywhere from ten to fifteen to twenty million bushels of wheat being raised every year. It is a splendid country, and if the government wants to connect up with the Edmonton-Dunvegan line, that line is graded through to the boundary at Pouce Coupe. There are some fifty-two miles of the line from Pouce Coupe to Spirit river. The grade is in but the rails are not laid. If this line was built in there it would supply freight enough to the western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific to put the road on a paying basis. If it is not built in there, I do not see where the road is going to get freight to put it on a paying basis. I do not ask the government to build this line if it is not a good business proposition, but I ask them to investigate and see what the possibilities of that country are. I may say that the Canadian Pacific railway has four parties in that country at the present time investigating and if the government cannot see their way to build that line after investigating I would ask them to leave the course free to the Canadian Pacific. Do not hold the country back. If the government will not build a line let the Canadian Pacific build out of Prince George and have running rights over the government railway on a rental basis. From the information I have the Canadian Pacific, if the government are not prepared to build, are quite prepared to go ahead and build.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): When the hon. member got up to address the committee I understood that he was in favour of this vote but after hearing his address I am rather confused about it, and I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is only joking, Mr. Chairman.

M. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is it the intention to survey from the east or the west side of the Rockies north to the Peace river or both?

Mr. GRAHAM: That will have to be determined by the Canadian National Railway management. They are going to take charge of this work and I hope they will have the opportunity of making quite an investigation in addition to making the survey.

Item agreed to.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Halifax, Louisburg and Bay St. Lawrence, via way ports, steam service between, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I just want to make a general observation on these steamship subventions. We have an awful lot of them, and the map is fairly criss-crossed with them if you try and follow them all along the coast. I am going to ask my hon. friend what is the necessity of having these new services? We have a tremendous lot now.

Mr. ROBB: There are four new ones, Items 523 and 524 for instance, but they are all serving new districts. The service provided by Item 524 is across the St. Lawrence to serve some people who are very far away from a railway. There is another item for $2,000, in settlement of a debt that was contracted last fall when we provided for getting fish out for the fishermen at a time when they could not get it out in any other way. I admit they are pretty hard to follow.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everybody knows perfectly well that this is a time to get rid of subventions instead of multiplying them. I am going to ask my hon. friend, will he take the trouble between now and next session to look at the map which he will find in his own department just criss-crossed with these services, and get busy and bring some order out of this chaos.

Mr. ROBB: Last year soon after the estimates were put through I instructed Mr. Tupper to make a very careful survey of the situation with a view to trying to eliminate some of these lines. He came back and I am bound to say that we did not succeed very well, but I could see that there was some reason for running these services into places where the people are without railways and would not have other means of communication.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has subsidized services going over practically the same routes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the general nature of these services? Is it purely a mail service or traffic and mail?

Mr. ROBB: Both. They nearly all carry mail.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is there any specific number of trips to be provided in connection with this service?

Mr. ROBB: That is provided in them all. This amount is required to provide for a service between Halifax and ports on the south shore of Cape Breton and thence to the north shore. The service is performed by the Mayflower Shipping Company of Halifax, with the steamer May Queen, which is 114 feet long, freight capacity 150 tons, and a speed of 9 knots. It performs a freight service but has no passenger accommodation. This service will give communication between Halifax and the east coast and enable fishermen to market their fish in Halifax. At the present time the people on the north coast can do nothing with their fish but send it to Sydney, which, of course, is not a fish market.

Item agreed to.

Indians—Nova Scotia—miscellaneous and unforeseen, further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The insertion of this item is a mistake. It is not necessary to vote this $25,000. It got in through an error.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that resolution 535 be withdrawn?

Resolution withdrawn.

Government of the Northwest Territories—purchase and maintenance of new ship, further amount required, $40,000.

To establish and operate wireless station at Mayo, $19,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Why is this new ship required, and what is the character of the vessel?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The committee will remember that when the estimates for the northwest territory were going through I explained we were buying a ship from the British Admiralty, and that a further amount of $40,000 would be asked to complete the payment. The sum of $40,000 was voted in the original estimates; this is to complete the payment for the ship.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the ship required for?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): To go to the Arctic.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): For what purpose?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): To visit the ports in the Arctic.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Lands and Parks—	
Compassionate allowance to T. W. Dwight,	$1,000
To provide for the payment to Mrs. F. T. E. Fortier of a compassionate allowance equal to the retiring allowance her husband would have been entitled to under the Public Service Retirement Act, chapter 49, 11-12 George V..	1,440
Canadian National Parks—	
Further amounted required..	25,000

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is this further amount of $25,000 for the Canadian National Parks required for?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We require this amount for the slaughtering of the buffalo in Wainwright park. The sum of $13,000 was voted for repairs to buildings but we need to hire men and must pay them their wages. As a matter of fact we cannot take the money from the sale of the meat, therefore we have to have a further amount for the purpose of carrying on this work of slaughtering the buffalo.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do I understand that this $25,000 is to hire men to slaughter buffalo?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is not merely for that, it is to cover the whole work in connection with it. We expect to slaughter a great number this year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I can inform the minister that if he needs men we can get a large number of competent persons in this district, anxious to get a little loose cash, who are quite willing to slaughter buffalo at a much lower rate than is involved in this amount of $25,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is not only to pay for the labour, there is the shipping and care of the meat. We have to put this meat into cold storage, and ship it to Edmonton or points eastward wherever we will be able to sell it. There are a great many expenses connected with it but we hope to make some money out of this work. We may not spend $25,000. I wish to assure my hon. friends we will not spend any more than is necessary but it is estimated we will require that amount in this work.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—amount required to provide salaries, transportation, travelling and general administrative expenses of Federal Appeal Board and District Boards of Review, etc., including provision for transportation and travelling expenses of applicants to and from seat of Appeal Board or District Boards of Review, remuneration to official soldiers' advisors and partial refund of expenses incurred in presentation of individual cases to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Board of Pension Commission, $357,996.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Are we, in passing this vote, taking it for granted that in another place they are going to allow our bill to go through?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is through, I understand.

Mr. BELAND: The bill has just been reported to the House. I have had the opportunity of looking over it for a moment and the provisions for the creation of District Appeal Boards have not been agreed to in the Senate. I will be in a position to give all details at the morning sitting later.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Will this vote be required?

Mr. BELAND: An estimate must be prepared and the money voted in advance.

Mr. SHAW: I do not want to delay the committee except for a moment. I was asked to present a petition to the House dealing with the conduct of a certain official in connection with the legislation, I believe, before the Senate. I want to direct the attention of the minister to the fact that apparently his officials have taken a contrary attitude to that legislation in the Upper Chamber. That must create a rather interesting situation between the minister who is responsible for the legislation and the deputy minister. I suggest that it will probably have the effect of lessening the confidence of ex-service men in the officers of the department. I simply want to mention that to the minister for his consideration.

Mr. CLARK: This item should be considered at the same time as the legislation out of which it arises. I do not see how the minister can estimate what amount will be required for this purpose until he knows the purpose for which the money will be required.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend knows it is usual to prepare an estimate on the legislation which goes through the House. We could not, for instance, wait to make an estimate until the bill was reported to the Senate and any amendments that were acceptable had been concurred in by the House. In some quarters the opinion is held that the estimates have been laid on the table rather late. I do not think we could have waited much longer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is claimed in four quarters.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All quarters.

Mr. BELAND: I may say that in 1920 my hon. friends laid Supplementary Estimates on the table on the eve of prorogation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were not of such a character as these.

Mr. BELAND: They were brought down on the eve of prorogation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not object to this item.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the Supplementary Supplementaries in 1927 amounted to $62,000,000.

Mr. BELAND: The Supplementary Estimates to which I refer were brought down on the eve of prorogation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the hon. member wishes to have a debate on this subject now we can oblige him.

Mr. CLARK: It is only a matter of a few hours. We ought to know what we are going to require the money for. Surely the minister can tell us what amount of money will be needed. I cannot see the object of voting money until you know what you are voting it for.

Mr. BELAND: We know what it is for. My hon. friend, of course, will realize that the Senate having done away with these boards certain central machinery will have to be provided for, and I understand the amount will be larger than the provisions already in the bill. If the whole amount is not needed it will not be spent.

Mr. CLARK: The Senate has made certain amendments to the bill and surely the minister has those amendments before him. I think the minister should tell the House whether the government proposes to accept the amendments.

Mr. BELAND: I cannot say until I have considered them.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses of a technical investigation under the supervision of the Department of Insurance, into the merits of the various forms of roof coverings from the standpoint of fire prevention, $15,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Could we have some explanation as to this item?

Mr. FIELDING: It is to provide for an investigation to be held into the various roof coverings which are being offered to the country, as having an important bearing on the question of fire protection.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Lord Selkirk Association towards the erection of a Monument to Peguis, the Saulteaux Indian Chief, $1,200.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This is one of the items that continually appear in the estimates for monuments and things of that character. I wish to enter my protest against the general practice of voting sums for these monuments. I rose to my feet as the Chairman was reading that item, and was speaking when he said the item was carried. I claim the item was not carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was in his seat when the item was declared carried The item was declared carried and there were not five members who rose to vote.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I object to rushing business through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is jamming the business through.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any hon. member desire to speak to the item?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Item agreed to.

British Empire Exhibition—further amount required, $150,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Can we have an explanation of that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The committee will remember that when the $500,000 item was going through I notified the committee that I had been informed that that was not sufficient to carry the work of the exhibition forward far enough, and a further vote would be required. It is estimated that the exhibition will cost Canada all told about $900,000. I told the committee that we were not spending as much money as Australia, or some of the other overseas dominions. We were informed that Australia was spending $1,200,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is Duncan Marshall to be in charge?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. he is not employed in the department over which I have charge. Mr. Tolmie is the man in charge.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Purchasing Commission—salaries and contingency including salary of L. H. Beer as Salvage Officer at $5,000 per annum, $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that a new office?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, an officer appointed for the purpose of salvaging property of the government. An officer of this character could save the government many thousands of dollars every year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where does the Civil Service Commission come in?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This particular person has had a wide experience in matters of this kind, and has himself prepared a plan which he submitted to the government for consideration, and on account of his experience in the work the government wish to retain him. That is why parliament is asked to vote this amount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Putting the name in the Estimates is just a way of getting around the act—the only way it could be done. If he has all these qualifications the presumption is the commission would appoint him; but I presume he has certain political qualifications that might not be taken into account by the commission.

Item agreed to.

Loans to provinces to encourage the erection of dwelling houses, on the terms and conditions set forth in the Order in Council of the 3rd of December, 1918, and amendments thereto from time to time made—to be applied only to cases in which the respective provincial governments have already made commitments with the municipalities; the appropriation to cease entirely at the end of the present fical year, $4,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Could the minister tell the committee how the $4,000,000 is distributed and if any part of it is available for British Columbia.

Mr. FIELDING: It is the aim of the government to terminate this expenditure, and we thought we were able to do so, but it has been represented that in several of the provinces they have come under obligations to the municipality, and they have asked us to make provision to cover these matters. I think the province of British Columbia is not concerned in the matter. It is Quebec chiefly, and Nova Scotia has asked for a moderate sum. The bulk of the money is to fulfil obligations which the government of Quebec has entered into with its municipalities. I do not think British Columbia has asked anything.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I assume that both of these provinces had not drawn their full quota.

Mr. FIELDING: No, Quebec had not drawn its full quota and I think Nova Scotia is in the same position. There has been no extension of the original quota.

Mr. HUMPHREY: If any obligations have been entered into by the other provinces, will any of this money be available?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, if the quota is not used.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Scottish Pioneer Association to assist in the "Hector" celebration, $15,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to have an explanation of this item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): A hundred and fifty years ago there came from the western islands to this country of ours certain Scottish settlers who laid the foundation of the future development of Canada through their successors. They landed in the province of Nova Scotia, and an association of Scottish Pioneers has been formed which has at its head as hon. president the Right Hon. Bonar Law, the former Premier of Great Britain, and as vice-presidents distinguished men in all parts of Canada. This association was formed to commemorate the landing of these Scottish pioneers. The celebration will take place, beginning the 15th July next. The monument has been obtained by subscription entirely apart from this grant. The monument is to be unveiled by His Excellency Lord Byng, and the events which usually follow an occasion of that kind will take place in the town and county during that week. Men of the Scottish race in all parts of Canada, including prominent men in British Columbia and in the western provinces, are interested in this event. I hope the committee, in appreciation of those men who came out in days of privation and difficulty and whose successors have gone to all parts of Canada, will gladly give this grant which will be expended by an organization made up of men whose character and reputation are undoubted in the celebration which everyone ought to attend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross) was interested in this matter. I think he wanted to find out why this grant was recommended, in view of the fact that refusals were made of requests for grants for exactly similar purposes. He told me that he did not expect to be here himself. He said he had asked my hon. friend for a grant for a celebration of a very historic event at Kingston, and that my hon. friend had told him that he would have to reject it, having rejected a similar request for Nova Scotia, having reference to this same vote. Apparently the Nova Scotia request which was refused is now being granted, and the Kingston request remains refused. He also said that a large gathering was to be held at Belleville of the United Empire Loyalists, and a grant was refused on the same grounds. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell me what difference there was to change his mind other than the fact that we have now as a member of the cabinet the acting Minister of National Defence—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The matter is not a local one at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —who represents the country and whose by-election is not yet fixed.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not remember any applications made for a grant either at Kingston or Belleville, but I would have to know something more about these matters before I could speak definitely. I am quite sure it was nothing of a similar character because I know the applications would be dealt with on the same basis. There is a grant further down the list to aid in the construction of a monument at Orillia. While I do not say that no applications were made either by Kingston or Belleville, I should like to look into these matters before speaking definitely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Orillia case is not a parallel one at all.

Mr. FIELDING: They are both to celebrate great events.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The grant at Orillia is to aid in the construction of the Champlain monument.

Mr. FIELDING: It is to celebrate a great event.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This "Hector" celebration is a different kind of a celebration, and our money is going to the celebration itself. The Champlain monument is not paralled to this case at all. I do not know what the Kingston case is.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend object to the celebration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I certainly do not.

Mr. FIELDING: Then we agree. Let us carry the item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does it follow that because one approves a celebration, he must pay for it out of the Dominion treasury?

Mr. FIELDING: If he approve the celebration, does he not the grant for the celebration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister was not drawing a parallel case. If there was a case at Kingston of the same character as this, it should have been dealt with on the same basis. A distinction should not have been made.

Mr. FIELDING: Is my right hon. friend prepared to state the nature of the Kingston case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know.

Mr. FIELDING: If he does not know, he had better not complain in connection with it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is not fair to speak of this celebration at Pictou as being purely local. The British government are sending four warships of the North Atlantic squadron. The United States government are sending two of their war vessels. The Governor of Massachusetts is to be in attendance, and His Excellency, the Governor General, is to be there. There will be no celebration at Kingston, in regard to anything relating to Scotch people coming to this country, that would be at all comparable with this one. One of the things the people of Nova Scotia take pride in is that Sir John A. Macdonald came to Ontario via Nova Scotia.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: A number of Scotchmen came into the Red River valley about a hundred years ago. Would the Minister of Finance consider an appropriation to cover a picnic in Winnipeg?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The acting Minister of National Defence a moment ago made a little appeal to us on behalf of those pioneers who had come to this country in times of stress and hardship. We in western Canada went into that country in times of stress, and we have been suffering a considerable amount of hardship. In western Canada we require railways; we are not getting them on the plea that the expense is too great; but we are still voting sums of money of this size for little picnics on the Nova Scotia coast. I, like all Irishmen, love Scotchmen, but I do not love Scotchmen dearly enough to vote them money like this at a time like this. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) that this item be reduced by $14,000.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. SHAW: I think this is establishing a very bad precedent. I have sufficient confidence in Scotchmen generally to believe that in those 150 years the descendants of the particular gentlemen who came over have long since accumulated much more than $15,000 and can readily put up the money.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A few years ago we celebrated at Quebec the tercentenary of the landing of Champlain. I think it was a source of pride to all citizens of Canada that in that manner there was celebrated the beginning of the French settlement in Canada. This particular celebration is to commemorate the landing of the Scotch for a first time in this country. It was the beginning of the settlement of the Scotch race throughout the Dominion of Canada. It is not a local celebration. As every hon. member knows, there are different strains that go to make up the composition of our people. There are the French, the English, the Scotch and the Irish. I hope in some appropriate way the country will take cognizance of the beginning in this country of settlement from Ireland and from England as well as the beginning of settlement from Scotland. I think it is advisable that these landmarks in our history should be celebrated. The children of the country grow up to know a little more about their country's history. This is a small amount that we are voting at the present time to commemorate the first migration from Scotland to this country, when one thinks of the part the Scotch have played in the settlement of Canada. This is something, I think, this parliament is entitled to pay some attention to.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): What about the Japs?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my hon. friend regards the Japanese as being a part of the Canadian population in the same way.

Mr. SPENCER: We have heard a great deal of this band of Scotsmen that came 150 years ago, but we have not heard much tonight about that other band that came a few weeks ago and went to western Canada. I think that some money might have been spent in connection with them.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Grant towards the expenses of the Canadian Athletic Team at the International Olympic Games in 1924. $15,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where are the Olympic games to be held and what arrangement has

been made in regard to the selection of the Canadian team?

Mr. MARTELL: As we are celebrating the advent to Canada of one of the greatest races in the world I would suggest that we devote the money under this item towards that celebration. If we have any money to spend I think it should be spent on such an object as this.

Mr. CHURCH: I wanted to ask the Acting Minister of National Defence what was being done to fix up the forts in the Niagara district, but the item has apparently been rushed through. So far as this particular vote is concerned I think that the government should see to it that the money is given to the actual contestants representing Canada in the Olympic games. The province of Ontario has contributed $5,000 to the fund on the understanding that the money is to go to the competitors themselves and not to enable persons in an executive capacity to have a free trip, and I think that the government should insist on the same thing in connection with this vote.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is desirable that we should send a team from Canada representative of our best athletes, and the committee would no doubt like to know how the selection is to be made.

Mr. FIELDING: We shall have to be assured before the money is paid that proper means will be taken to see that the athletes of all provinces are given a fair show. I have forgotten the names of the gentlemen of the delegation that waited upon me, but I think they were introduced by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church). We felt that the object was a good one, because undoubtedly we are all proud of our athletes, and their participation in these games will be a splendid advertisement for Canada. We shall take pains to see that the various provinces are well represented, and I have not the slightest doubt that before the money is paid over we shall have satisfactory assurances on that score.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am not objecting to this vote for a single moment, because I am sure the object is an excellent one. Indeed, representations were made to me to try to ensure that the principal athletic organizations of the country should be given a voice in the matter. I do ask the minister to see that these various organizations shall be heard and that the matter shall not rest with any one association.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a reasonable request and we will endeavour to meet it.

Item agreed to.

Public Archives—arrears of cost of living bonus, $110.96.

Mr. FIELDING: I move that this item be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Further amount required for passport office, $2,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the government any knowledge yet of the reported establishment of a Canadian publicity bureau in London under a Mr. Cranfield? I inquired in regard to this subject some weeks ago.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One-third of the cost of this publicity work is borne by the government, one-third by the Canadian Pacific Railway and one-third by the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is it Mr. Cranfield was selected?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He was simply selected by the railways and the government for the purpose of carrying on publicity work in connection with immigration. The work is under the control and supervision of Mr. Obed Smith.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the annual expenditure?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is not very considerable. I do not remember whether it is $15,000 or $25,000. I have the information in the office, but not here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What qualifications has Mr. Cranfield? That is the point I am raising.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understood he had been employed for some years by the government in publicity work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never heard of him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is my information.

Mr. GOULD: Is it the purpose of the department or of the government to continue the issuing of passports between Canada and, say, Great Britain or does this pertain to foreign countries?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the subject of passports was discussed in the House before, a question was asked as to the necessity for issuing passports to persons going to the British Isles. The Department of External Affairs, after the discussion which took place in the House, drew the attention of the British government to the circumstances and

to the opinion expressed by some of the members that the time had come for the discontinuance of the issuing of passports to persons going to Great Britain from this country. A reply has not yet been received from the British government. The passport regulations are imposed by the British government; we have nothing to do with them.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the removal of the span of the bridge over False Creek, B.C., to permit of the movements of vessels up to the end of 1923, $6,065.92.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is this bridge span moved again? We have had this item before.

The CHAIRMAN: $4,000 is a revote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not mentioned here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Do we vote a large sum like this every time the bridge span is moved?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is there nobody in the government who can answer the hon. gentleman's question? Surely there is someone with the information at his disposal. I remember this item last year; it is here again this year. I support the hon. gentleman in his request for information.

Mr. MURDOCK: I understand this is a stationary bridge which occasionally has to be lifted and moved to let certain traffic through. The Canadian Pacific Railway is paid a certain amount every time that is done.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Do we originate the traffic?

Mr. MURDOCK: As to that I do not know.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I understood that something of the first expense was in connection with certain government boats that were built up False creek, but I presume we are not continuing to build boats there, thus requiring the taking down of the bridge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to mention a railway matter here, because we are getting quite close to the end and an appropriate time may not come again. I have a report to the effect that the entire traffic staff of the Canadian National is being removed to Halifax from Truro. Can the minister give us any information as to whether that is correct?

Mr. GRAHAM: I was asked that question to-day by some hon. member. I have not heard a word of it.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: While on the point, may I direct the minister's attention to a question on the order paper as to coal purchased by the Canadian National Railway? It has been on for some time, and if the next sitting of the House is the last for this session I have to draw the minister's attention to it to-night to be sure that we get the answer at the next sitting.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I have the answer upstairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As long as I get it at the next sitting, that will be quite satisfactory

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the only trouble is as to the distribution. I am not sure we have that, but I think we have the other.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will agree to get the other information asked for as well. The Minister of Public Works is absent and his deputy is not available at the moment. I will have the information at the next sitting.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay the creditors of the late Prince Rupert Dry Dock and Engineering Co., Ltd., for services rendered, material supplied or moneys advanced in connection with the construction of the Scottish and Britisher in Prince Rupert, B.C., $68,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: May we have some explanation of this vote?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The same appplies as to the other one. I will have it to-morrow.

Mr. TOLMIE: I would point out that in connection with the construction of two fishery cruisers at Victoria the builders got into difficulties. The merchants supplying goods to the contractors visited the marine office and the marine agent there promised that the government would guarantee payment of their bill. I understand that they have not been able to get any satisfaction in that respect. I simply draw the minister's attention to the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will make a note of it.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company towards construction of bridge over the Second Narrows of Burrard Inlet, B.C., being revote of portion of subsidy authorized by statute, chap. 46, sec. 3, 1913, $100,000.

Mr. SPENCER: May we have some information as to this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The municipality—I am speaking from memory—are

constructing a bridge over the Burrard inlet. I have forgotten what the amount is—

Mr. CLARK: $1,000,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a contribution to the construction of that bridge over navigable waters.

Mr. CLARK: I would refer the committee to the statutes of 1913, under which subsidy in the amount of $350,000 was granted for this purpose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the minister will explain why it is in the estimates if it is a subsidy granted by statute.

Mr. FIELDING: Speaking from memory, I think the subsidy expired; it was granted some years ago but they were not able to use it. That is my recollection, though I am not quite certain of it.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses of a Royal Commission to inquire into proposed prohibition or restriction of the export of pulpwood, $20,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What does the government hope to accomplish by the appointment of this royal commission?

Mr. FIELDING: The question whether or not it is expedient to prohibit the export of pulpwood is quite a controversial one. I know some people think it is a very one-sided question, but we have abundant evidence that there are two sides to it. Our purpose is to afford all parties interested an opportunity to state their views.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government has already stated that there will be no prohibition of the pulpwood grown on farms, and if you except the pulpwood grown on farms and the pulpwood grown on Crown lands the rest of the pulpwood is hardly worth the commission. We have the bill now, and we have the commission, and we have to pay for the commission, and I may just venture the prediction that we will end up with the same policy with which we began.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the provinces that prohibit on Crown lands, is it not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This would appear to me to be a matter that the government ought to be able to decide without the appointment of a commission. In any event there are enough officials in the employment of the government to obtain any information that any commission could obtain. This certainly should be a question of policy. This seems to me a most absurd vote in view of the stand the government have already taken as pointed out by the leader of the Opposition with regard to the exportation of pulpwood from lands owned by private individuals. I therefore move to reduce the item by $19,999.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is one aspect of this question that I think is important and should be taken into account by the committee. There is probably no single economic problem more important than the conservation of our forests, and the extent to which the forests are being depleted partly through insects, largely through fires and to a certain extent through the export of our pulpwood is a factor that should become more generally known than it is. If pulpwood is to be prohibited from export it will be because of the rapidity of our forest depletion. The commission will be most helpful in helping to educate the public as to the extent to which the forests are being depleted, and if such action became necessary as to prohibit the export of pulpwood, will make it perfectly apparent to our neighbouring nation that the government's action in the matter is not prompted by any thought of retaliation for any purpose, but that the reason is an important economic one. I think that is one factor that the House should take into account in considering how very necessary and advisable it is that a commission should be appointed at this time to help give the country the fullest information with respect to the extent to which our forests are being depleted.

Mr. GOULD: It has occurred to me that if in connection with this commission appointed to look into the depletion of our forests as outlined by the Prime Minister some provision were made for cruising our timber limits to find out just what our timber resources are, a good purpose might be served. A vote of $20,000, of course, would not be sufficient to carry on that work in addition to what this commission is going to do. I think such a cruise would be worth while from an economic point of view, for then we would know just what our timber resources are.

Amendment (Mr. Sutherland) negatived; Yeas, 12; Nays, 44.

Canada Grain Act, administration of—additional amount required, $80,000

Mr. SHAW: What are the particulars of this?

Mr. ROBB: This is to provide for a reclassification and salary increases for the grain men at Fort William and other points. The

records show that the Board of Grain Commissioners have recommended these salary increases after discovering that most of the grain houses in Canada are paying higher wages than the board, and the board was in consequence losing many of its good men. This is to provide for the increase recommended by the board.

Mr. SHAW: Are the officers in this branch under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were these salary increases recommended by the Grain Commission?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, to the Civil Service Commission. The procedure is this: The Grain Commissioners make a recommendation for classification and salary increases which is submitted to the Civil Service Commission, and if approved by them the minister puts through an order in council covering it.

Mr. GOULD: The minister states that private companies can afford to pay larger salaries than the Board of Grain Commissioners. That is undoubtedly due to the exorbitant profits they have taken from the people in the West through their practices in the past. If their profits were cut down to a legal point it is possible they would not become such great competitors with the Board of Grain Commissioners for help as the minister indicates, and consequently there would not be the necessity for increasing the salaries of these employees.

Mr. ROBB: I would not admit that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the government any method or any habit of inquiring into a request for increased expenditure, or is it the invariable rule to grant whatever is asked?

Mr. ROBB: Oh, no. Every request is gone into very carefully and sometimes it is rejected.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad to hear that. The minister might give me an instance of anything that has been rejected.

Mr. ROBB: I will tell my hon. friend right now, and I think it will come before the House at its next session if there are any amendments to the Canada Grain Act. We find that it is not easy to get men on the Grain Commission staff. For instance, one man who came to us recently claims that the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company were offering more money than was paid him by the Board of Grain Commissioners.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. GOULD: I have in mind a return that was brought down by the Department of Trade and Commerce for one of our members here a short time ago, in which I noticed that the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur weighed out 19,000,000 bushels more in 1922 than they had taken in. I know part of this goes into the consolidated revenue fund but I wish to point out to the minister that the profits rightly belong to the people of the West who grew those nineteen million and odd bushels of wheat. In view of the profits made by these private companies it is no wonder they can afford to pay such salaries, and that the Grain Commissioners find it necessary to increase the stipends of their officers.

Mr. ROBB: I am not disputing the statement because there is really no evidence to prove it but I will give my hon. friend the other side of the shield. The eastern millers and grain buyers contend they have to pay for a shortage, because there is a shortage in the shipments that come across the lakes.

Mr. SHAW: Has the judgment of the Supreme Court as to the validity of the Grain Act been received yet?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the salaries and expenses of the Grain Inquiry Commission, re lake grain rates, $13,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What salaries are paid to the commission, is there any special amount?

Mr. ROBB: I have not the order in council with me. My recollection is that it is $20 or $25 a day, I am not sure.

Mr. HOEY: This will not meet the entire cost of the commission.

Mr. ROBB: I think it is to pay the balance. There was a vote last session.

Mr. HOEY: You could not give us the entire cost?

Mr. ROBB: The amount voted in 1922-23 was $40,000 and the expenditure was $28,695 leaving an unexpended balance of $11,304. It has been estimated that about $13,000 will be required for the expenses of 1923-24. My hon. friends will understand that the vote for last year lapsed on the 31st March.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What steps are the government taking to make this commission of any value? Perhaps the minister would give a list of Liberal lawyers that have been retained?

Mr. ROBB: That is under another item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought this was the commission.

Mr. ROBB: The other one is passed I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not heard much about the work of the commission. It has been pretty quiet so far.

Mr. ROBB: The commission only opened at Edmonton this week, on Monday, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who has the minister employed and what are his instructions? Is counsel instructed to go into all the practices of the grain exchange and the grain dealers?

Mr. ROBB: That is covered by an order in council. I have not a copy with me. I will get a copy and send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The order in council appoints the commission and it directs an inquiry into this and that. What I want to know is what are the instructions to counsel. It is counsel that really conducts matters the commission act as judges. What are the instructions to counsel and who are the counsel?

Mr. ROBB: The order in council is a mandate to the commission and the commissioners give the instructions. The order in council is a mandate to the commission to go on and make this inquiry. If my right hon. friend will examine the order in council he will discover that it is wide open. No person is to be protected; we desire the fullest and freest inquiry with an idea of bringing before parliament such amendments to the Canada Grain Act that will cure alleged abuses if such abuses are discovered by the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister tell me who the lawyer was? Did the government exercise as good political care in the appointment of the lawyers as they did in the appointment of the commission? Who is the head counsel if the minister cannot state the entire list?

Mr. ROBB: We asked Mr. Justice Turgeon to visit Winnipeg and pick out whom he thought the best man available. Mr. Justice Turgeon recommended Mr. C. P. Wilson. Perhaps my hon. friend will know him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The initials are those of Mr. Wilson.

Mr. ROBB: The government decided that $100 a day was ample recompense for a lawyer. We thought that was a reasonable fee but Mr. Wilson asked for $150 a day.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. ROBB: As Mr. Justice Turgeon thought Mr. Wilson was the best man available we said "You can give him $150 a day". Then he telegraphed declining to accept that amount unless we could guarantee him the price paid to a certain lawyer in Toronto, unnamed, who had conducted similar investigations, and we said "No, you will have to look elsewhere."

Mr. MEIGHEN: What similar investigation?

Mr. ROBB: I could not tell my hon. friend, I am reciting what the telegram contained. Then we offered it to Mr. D'Arcy Scott, who had been for ten years a railway commissioner in Canada and had a wide experience in the grain trade. Mr. D'Arcy Scott was appointed with Mr. Fisher, of Winnipeg, as junior counsel.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister made a bad slip there. He first said it was the commission that was looking after counsel. Afterwards, in a moment of weakness, he said "We offered it to Mr. D'Arcy Scott." I was pretty confident that is who really did offer the appointment. And Mr. Fisher is the junior?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No political mistake in the case of either of them.

Mr. ROBB: I am bound to say I do not know the politics of Mr. Fisher. I am told that Mr. D'Arcy Scott was willing to be a Progressive candidate at the last election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That might be a great guarantee of his political character anyway. The Minister of Agriculture would know. I think I can give a reasonable estimate now of the results of the commission. What is to be paid Mr. D'Arcy Scott?

Mr. ROBB: One hundred dollars a day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And what to Mr. Fisher?

Mr. ROBB: I am not sure whether it is $50 or $75, I think it is $75.

An hon. MEMBER: What was paid to Mr. Kelly?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Kelly's work was just about a thousand times as important and heavy, and if this commission is as successful as the other I shall be more astonished than at any other time since I have been in parliament.

Item agreed to.

Additional amount required to provide for the Canadian Exhibition in France, $60,000.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like to have an explanation of this vote?

Mr. ROBB: The sum of $50,000 was voted in the Main Estimates for 1923-24. A similar amount was provided in the estimates for 1922-23, and of the said amount $6,504, was expended. The additional amount required is for the purpose of installing the exhibition for two or three months in L'Orangerie, in the Place de la Concorde. The French government have expressed their intention of spending in the vicinity of $100,000 to prepare the interior of this building for the Canadian Exhibition.

Item agreed to.

British and Foreign News Service, $21,333.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What is this for?

Mr. ROBB: This is to provide a service through Reuters, to send out news of business conditions generally throughout Canada and other matters that will interest readers overseas wherever Reuters have a connection. There will be a contract made with Reuters to put out 10,000 words monthly of Canadian news, designed to promote the interests of Canada. There is to be, in addition to the news which Reuters already cable to Canada from the world at large, and which they undertake to maintain at the present standard, the general dissemination throughout the United kingdom and the British dominions, of mail news calculated to arouse and maintain an interest in Canada and Canadian activities commercially, industrially and agriculturally.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Who engaged these writers?

Mr. ROBB: Reuters is a world news service.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I thought the hon. member said "writers." This is simply another subsidy for this particular news firm.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member may call it what he likes. We call it an advertisement for Canada, and of Canada. The government has nothing to do with putting out news. It is left to the representative of Reuters in Canada.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I cannot see, with all the services that we have at present, that we require to still subsidize another service. We have exhibitions of all kinds, and are simply spending untold money advertising the country. If conditions were as they ought to be in this country I think the regular news services would look after that.

Mr. ROBB: That is the unfortunate part of it. The news going out from Canada is not such as would place Canada in a right light in another country. I hold in my hand—and my hon. friend may have observed the item, because it has been published in the press—a despatch from London, England, dated 25th June, intimating that while the news going to England from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa placed those countries in a favourable light before the British people, the news going out from Canada sent out by news agents did not have that effect. The clipping goes on to state:

> On the other hand, the Canadian news of the past month has dealt with such matters as the murders by Rogers, the North Bay bandit, the trial of Father Delorme for the alleged murder of his half-brother, the doings of bootleggers on the border, forest fires, floods and the difficulties of the emigrant party who recently left the Hebrides to settle in Canada.

We want to put Canada in a better light.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: You will admit these things take place?

Mr. ROBB: I will admit it is not the best kind of advertising.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The things that go on in this House are not the best kind of advertising. At the same time these conditions prevail, and I might say that nearly all the labour papers in the Old Country are carrying news, a great deal of it taken from Hansard, which is not the best advertisement for Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: It is the fault of those who make the speeches.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is the truth nevertheless.

Mr. BUREAU: We deny it.

Mr. FIELDING: Would the hon. member tell the House from whose speeches they quote?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: They make their own selection, but they are quoting Hansard in the Daily Herald as well as in the Glasgow Forward and the Labour Leader. You might find extracts from speeches given during the last few sessions in which are stated the actual conditions which prevail in western Canada.

Mr. SHAW: I would like to ask the minister about a grant of $50,000 to the Canadian Press. I have never come across it.

Mr. ROBB: That is not in this department. It is in the main estimates and we will come to it later.

Mr. SHAW: It has not been reached.

Mr. ROBB: Not yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In connection with this item, I do not know what control the minister

has. I fancy Reuters will get the news that sells, as well as the other people. It is the news that sells that is dealt with.

Mr. BUREAU: And it favours the Tory party.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Rogers murder at North Bay, and those terrible things that have occurred lately, would indicate that we have not got the new Heaven and earth under this party although we were promised it. The kind of news sent out is frequently the product of the conditions that the times are cursed with. A little while ago I asked the minister if he could think of anything in the way of appeal for money or a voracious demand that this government had refused? Looking back over the years and seeing them one by one yielding to these requests, I thought I would inquire if anything had been refused at any time. The minister did not give me any answer at the time. Perhaps he can think of an item now.

Mr. ROBB: The proposed scheme is not new. It was originally presented to the government three years ago. It was recommended to council for acceptance by Sir Robert Borden on June 11th 1920, but action was deferred until September of that year, when the proposals were reconsidered by Mr. Meighen at a conference with Sir Roderick Jones, chairman and managing director of Reuters. The proposals however have since been left in abeyance, owing, it is stated, wholly to various other exigencies, though the scheme went as far as having the Justice department prepare a draft agreement.

Mr. GOULD: The item for British and foreign news service, $21,333,34, suggests to me that it is a third of the total item.

Mr. ROBB: I should have told my hon. friend that the contract is for $32,000 a year, but as the service will begin on the 1st of August, this amount is for the balance of the fiscal year.

Item agreed to.

Towards the construction of a grain elevator at Halifax, N.S., $200,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The information I have is that there was an elevator there that had a little grain in it some years, and for some years none. I fancy it was burned down. Any way it is not there now. I had a return on this the other day. I think it was used substantially just once. I believe it was partly built by the railway and partly by the city. At any rate there were joint contributions. Can the hon. member tell us just what special event the government has in mind that caused it to deem it the part of wisdom to build a large elevator there?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am rather at a loss to understand just what the right hon. leader of the Opposition means by the remarks he has made and the remarks which he has previously made, but which I did not hear. He was criticizing the remarks of another hon. member this evening and suggesting that the hon. member was tired or sleepy, possibly dreaming. This may be the reason of the remarks of my hon. friend in respect of certain expenditures in the county of Halifax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The estimates are no dream.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I might say that the construction of a grain elevator at Halifax was projected in 1912, under the government then led by Sir Robert Borden, and which my hon. friend supported. In that year my right hon. friend will remember that it was decided that the railway terminals of Halifax were to be properly or improperly—improperly, I think—removed from one end of the city to the other, and the erection of this elevator was a portion of that project. The present elevator, which was constructed jointly, I think, by the city, the government of Nova Scotia, and the Dominion government many years ago, cannot now very well be used by reason of the fact that the railway terminal facilities have been moved to another end of the city. Further, the present grain elevator is obsolete and not suitable for the handling of grain.

I cannot say, and I am sure my hon. friend cannot very accurately tell us, what quantity of grain has gone through the Halifax elevator. It is true that port is not a big grain exporting port. The business men of Halifax hardly expect it to be a large grain exporting port, but still a certain quantity may very profitably find an outlet through Halifax. I have been personally advised by two or three of the largest shipping companies using that port during the past winter, that a modern elevator of a million bushels capacity would be of great service to the port and to shipping. At the present time a great deal of shipping might go to Halifax were it not for the reason that they are unable to secure grain as a partial cargo.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could the hon. gentleman not think of something that might be useful to Halifax and at the same time would cost a little less money?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) I am told by shipping men and business men of Halifax that this expenditure would be extremely useful to the port of Halifax. I believe that is a fact. The quantity of shipping which enters or leaves any Canadian port is largely determined by whether or not they can obtain a partial loading of grain. That is necessary as regards the port of Halifax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that Halifax has not handled grain for years, except during the war. When there was the grain to handle, the elevator handled it all right. But the business there is absolutely negligible and must be so as long as we have a charge for hauling grain on the railway and railway costs are heavy.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friend is entirely wrong in saying that very small grain shipments have gone through the port of Halifax. It is true that grain shipments from Halifax have not been large in any one year, but a substantial quantity of grain has gone through that port. There is a difference in the freight rates as between St. John and Halifax of one cent per 100 pounds. I hope, however, this differential will be abolished as it should be. I am instructed that it costs more to move grain from St. John to St. John West where the grain is placed on board steamers than it would cost to move that grain to Halifax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have that from persons who have actual knowledge.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend thinks any business for the elevator is going to come in that way, he is very much mistaken. I think my hon. friend really knows there is no business there. How much is to be the total cost of this elevator which may be very useful in another direction in a very short time?

Mr. ROBB: We have put this amount in the estimates primarily to prepare the plans and to be in a position, if such is deemed proper, to start work on that elevator early enough so that it will be ready for next season's crop. There is no probability of getting it ready for this season's crop. We shall be guided by the advice of experts as to the capacity of an elevator that would pay at that port. My hon. friend has hinted at a reclassification of rates. That will be taken into consideration.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the situation this that the government has no idea of the quantity of grain likely to go through that port or the capacity of the elevator required? They are sure of nothing except that there is to be an election.

Mr. FIELDING: Did the large and expensive scheme of terminals constructed by the late government not include an elevator? They spent, I do not know how many millions there. I would almost think this elevator would be as useful as the terminals.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That may be; but the elevator was not gone on with for a very good reason, and that was that the business was not offering for it. Business is not now offering for the elevator. If I am wrong, I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to correct me. According to his own statement, he does not know what size of an elevator he has to put up or the business likely to be obtained. He is to have somebody inquire into the matter.

Mr. CAHILL: Why did the late government spend $22,000,000 there on terminals?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend overlooked one thing, namely that the quantity of grain moved depends upon whether ships will be available to carry it. Contracts to carry grain are not made by the railway people themselves, and the grain broker who wants to ship to Liverpool will ship via Halifax if there are facilities and ships there to carry the grain. During the past few years merchants have not been regularly shipping to Halifax because there has not been space. Indications are that this space will be obtained and work will come for the elevator. My hon. friend ought surely to encourage the idea that we should have facilities in our ports in winter for shipments of grain instead of sending the ships to American ports. If he wants to oppose the idea that we should have within our own boundaries and harbours facilities by which Canadian produce can be carried abroad and imports can be brought to our ports, that is a very curious policy. If he wishes to have the ships in winter going to Boston and other American ports instead of to Canadian ports, that will be the policy of my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend always conveniently forgets everything he likes to forget. There is another winter port, that is neither Portland nor any other American port, and that is St. John. He also forgets that usually grain travels by the cheapest railway route.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Halifax is the nearest port to the British Isles.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose he says it is just as cheap to carry grain by rail as by water.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not said that at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is the same thing. You have an extra 276 miles' haul, if I remember rightly. That, however, is getting away from the point. What information has my hon. friend as to the income of the port and the quantity of grain to be handled?

Mr. ROBB: My information is, according to the estimates of the previous government, that the requirements of that port would be for an elevator with a capacity of from 750,000 to 1,000,000 bushels.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection is that we used to use about 60,000 bushels in trimming during the busy period.

Mr. ROBB: Each trip?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In a day when things were busy—60,000 bushels in and 60,000 out.

Mr. ROBB: That is an admission that an elevator is required.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was during the war period.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No grain went through the port of Halifax during the war.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had at one time a movement of as much as thirty cars a day.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think so.

Mr. ROBB: I would not like to get into a dispute between my two hon. friends who were members of the same government at that time.

Mr. FINN: It seems to me that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) takes a very pessimistic and gloomy view of the development of an eastern national port, namely the port of Halifax. It is equally as pessimistic a view as my hon. friend took when, as chairman of the Railway Commission, he laid down that very explicit doctrine that geographical disadvantages should not be taken into consideration in the fixing of rates. We are a part of this great confederation; and the great leaders who have passed to the beyond held out to us in Nova Scotia and to the citizens of Halifax the promise that if the province remained in confederation Nova Scotia and Halifax would become the Atlantic

frontage of the Dominion. And if my hon. friend will only go and look at the motto above the entrance to this magnificent structure, raised and reared by his government, he will see there written these words:

> The wholesome sea is at her gates,
> Her gates both East and West.

We may have the wholesome sea but we have not the gates. But it was in the wisdom of the late Liberal Chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to foresee the future and build the Transcontinental, taking the road to Moncton as a common centre for the shipment of grain and other products of the West in winter, from Halifax and St. John. When the short line is completed from a point above Port Arthur on the Canadian National up to the Transcontinental, with easier grades and shorter mileage, the people of Halifax feel that it will be the duty of the Canadian National system to see that grain and other products of the West not routed through any other ports shall be carried to the ports of Halifax and St. John in winter. If these things are not done then perhaps some of the things spoken of by a gentleman in the legislature of Nova Scotia and referred to in the press of the Maritime provinces may come to be more than mere words and cold type. I regret that the state of my health to-night forbids my entering as largely into this subject as I should like. But it is vital to the interests of Nova Scotia, it is vital to the city of Halifax, that proper attention be given this matter. I say it is vital to the city of Halifax, which Sir Charles Tupper declared would be, as a result of this national policy, a forest of masts if that province remained true to confederation. We are spending to-day millions of money for the development of the port of Portland, and this is the result of an act of administration on the part of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen in the taking over of the Grand Trunk and the terminals at Portland. This was a legacy bequeathed to the present government, who have in turn handed it over to Sir Henry Thornton and his board of management. I believe that Sir Henry Thornton is willing to do the right thing by the Maritime provinces, and my hon. friend must know that Sir Henry has recommended that an elevator should be built at Halifax with a capacity of at least 750,000 bushels, if not a million. It is his intention to divert to Halifax, as he has a right to do, that proportion of the grain and other products from the West that can and ought to be carried through this port. The rate to Halifax will then be the same as to St. John or Portland or

New York. Montreal carries one cent less and when the differential referred to by my hon. colleague (Mr. Maclean) is removed as between St. John and Halifax, then New York, Portland, St. John and Halifax will be on a parity. There is no sound reason why Halifax should not share as a national port in the shipment of products of the West and of central Canada to the Old Country and the Mediterranean in future. These are my hopes; and I regret that my hon. friend should take the gloomy, pessimistic view he has displayed in reference to the future of Halifax as a port. I do not share that view and I am sure that if we both live a few years longer and Halifax is given an opportunity he will have reason to revise his opinion and will be quite willing to help to make it what it was always intended to be, the eastern gateway, one of the national ports of Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have listened with a great deal of interest, not to say amazement, to some of the remarks which have been made in this House by the representatives from the East and the West, who suggest that, if certain concessions are not granted them, certain veiled threats which they make are going to be carried into effect. I have almost come to the conclusion that the government are prepared to outdo that last awful night in the city of Toronto, a few sessions ago. We are nearing the dawn of another day and we hear now the story of the building of the Transcontinentl railway and what it is going to bring about in this country; and this is the justification for an expenditure of $200,000 to be voted in the Supplementary Estimates, which certainly, at any rate, should have appeared in the Main Estimates. There are two items here of a similar nature, notwithstanding that there are many parts of this country where the government would be much more justified in expending money in the building of elevators than at these particular points. I refer to the province of Ontario where there are no internal elevators for the accommodation of the farmers. They are not receiving any consideration of this kind, but we are not coming before the government and making all sorts of veiled threats as to what may take place; we are not hinting at secession if certain concessions are not made. I never heard a more absurd argument advanced in support of any proposition than that which has been offered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Finn). No doubt the nature of his argument is due to the fact, which he mentioned a moment ago, that he is not in good health to-night.

[Mr. Finn.]

Mr. FINN: When I made the remark in regard to threats I said that the leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia, the gentleman that was responsible for the statement, was the leader of the Tory party in the legislature of the province; and the Halifax Herald, the leading Tory paper in Nova Scotia, echoed the same thing.

Item agreed to.

Towards the construction of a grain elevator at Edmonton, Alta, $200,000.

Mr. JELLIFF: In whatever I may say on this vote I do not want to be construed either by the administration or by the people of Edmonton as opposing any legitimate wish that might be expressed founded on the necessities of the grain trade there or of the railways for the construction of an internal elevator at that point. I object to the government overlooking a claim that has been admitted by Dr. Magill, Chairman of the Grain Commission, and that has been on record for the last ten or twelve years, a claim for the establishment of an internal storage elevator at Lethbridge. I was very much surprised when I saw this item of $200,000 in the Estimates. I want to point out the difference between the crop production and the

5 a.m.

facilities afforded at Edmonton compared with Lethbridge. Three transcontinental railways run into Edmonton, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific, and two of these lines run to western ports. On the other hand, in the Lethbridge district we are tied up to one railway system, the Canadian Pacific, which, in spite of a most efficient administration, has always fallen short of its ability to cope with the demands connected with the handling of our grain in that district. One of the main reasons for the establishing of this elevator at Edmonton is to facilitate the movement of grain westward to the Pacific coast and to try to effect a saving for the farmer. I heartily agree with that, but I would point out that last year in the freight district of Lethbridge we produced 22,000,000 bushels of wheat, over one-third the entire production of Alberta, a condition which, however, resulted in a serious shortage of cars in that district. At one time last season there were in Cardston at least one hundred four-horse teams with loads of wheat, some of it drawn from a distance of twenty miles, and that wheat was there from one to three days because of lack of elevator space, due, in turn, to the lack of cars. The same was true at Woolford Station, east of Cardston and at other points throughout that district. In

1915 we had a crop in the Lethbridge freight district of 41,000,000 bushels of wheat, nearly one-half the entire crop production of Alberta. The result was that the elevators were filled up and the delivery was continued until June and July of the following season. I believe the ex-Minister of Finance was given that record when he was out in our country investigating the railway situation. Thousands upon thousands of acres of wheat remained in the stook all winter, simply on account of that car shortage and lack of elevator space. Thousands upon thousands of bushels of grain were threshed into open bins in the fields; the grain bleached and deteriorated in quality and the farmers suffered losses running into hundreds of thousands of dollars. If there is a district in Canada that needs an internal storage elevator it is in Lethbridge district. This whole system of internal storage elevators originated in the Lethbridge district.

Mr. CAHILL: With what government?

Mr. JELLIFF: That was in 1904 or 1905. The whole thing was founded upon the acute shortage of cars which was occurring year after year and of course, the large crops we were producing in that district. Lethbridge is one of the largest coal producing districts in Canada, and the season for the hauling of coal is concurrent with the period during which the heavy hauling of wheat should proceed. At least 200 cars a day are required to move the coal product at that period, and it is natural that when there are two demands of that kind the more urgent should be met, namely, the transport of coal to the people of the prairies. I have two telegrams here that I want to read. The first is dated at Lethbridge, June 27, and reads as follows:

Press despatch to-day states supplementary estimates provide internal elevators Edmonton. No mention Lethbridge. Urge you press our claim. One-third Alberta wheat last year grown on Lethbridge Railway division. Manifestly unfair government overlook this district where grain grown and elevator badly needed.

That is from the president of the Lethbridge Board of Trade. Here is another telegram I got early this morning from the secretary of the Lethbridge Board of Trade:

Our board passed strong resolution to-day urging you to protest government's action locating proposed elevator at Edmonton. Northern Alberta heaviest crop is oats—

That means in the Edmonton district.

—which is not exportable commodity via Vancouver and the Panama canal. Provincial government estimates between forty and fifty million bushels wheat crop on Lethbridge Railway division this year. Dry lands crops augmented by future irrigation crops warrant and will sustain elevator here. Farmers in this district have been led to belive that favorable consideration would be given to Lethbridge when any additional elevators were establishd.

They have been led to believe that for years. The movement for the construction of these internal storage elevators, as I have already stated, began in that district, and began on account of the yearly shortage which we experienced there of cars necessary to handle our grain crop. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I claim that I am the parent of the internal storage elevator idea It is the only thing in the country I can lay claim to being parent to. On account of the difficulty of securing sufficient storage and sufficient cars in southern Alberta a conference was called some twenty years ago by the Hon. Mr. Rutherford, at that time premier of the province of Alberta. Mr. Rutherford kindly sent me an invitation to attend that conference, which was composed of farmers, business men, railway men, grain men and bankers. At that conference the main subject of discussion was the western shipment of grain. Delegates were there from Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster, from all over Alberta, and one or two I think from Saskatchewan, and the burden upon their thoughts at that time was shipping by the A.B.C. route as it was called, which meant the Alberta-British Columbia route. At that conference the question of car shortage came up. I was asked to open the discussion on what was known as our old Manitoba Grain Act, and in connection therewith I advocated the building of internal storage elevators to relieve the shortage of cars for one thing, in the second place to encourage the development of the milling industry in our principal cities in the West, and in the third place to minister to the wants of our mixed farming industry. These were the three points that were involved.

A short time after that convention this matter was taken up by the Board of Grain Commissioners. They came out to Lethbridge and held quite a long sitting there. I was before the board at that time and this question of the establishment of internal storage elevators was thoroughly canvassed. The board returned and presented their report to parliament recommending the building of these internal storage elevators for the purposes to which I have referred. Then the board went out again through the western country to determine where they should locate these internal storage elevators. They thoroughly canvassed every locality in which their meet-

ings were held, and they decided that Lethbridge was one of the points where one of these elevators should be located, and they so reported to parliament. The recommendation was made by Dr. Magill, the chairman of the Grain Board. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will find that recommendation in his files. I do not know how it happened but the government built three of these storage elevators, one at Moose Jaw, one at Saskatoon, and one at Calgary. It is not for me to comment upon the location of these elevators, but the government overlooked the one place where the movement had orginated and where the car situation is at different times the most acute of any place in the country that I know of. They placed these elevators at these other points. Now continually from that time up till now, born of necessity of the situation there, petition after petition, letter after letter, presentation after presentation has been sent to Ottawa urging the construction of an internal storage elevator to meet our needs at that point, and I cannot see why that request has not been granted. I cannot see why these other elevators should be provided for at this time and Lethbridge again be left out. We have here in this telegram the statement, and I am sure this will be pleasing to the Minister of Finance because he was speaking of the prospects of the West a few nights ago, that the estimate of the provincial government is that we shall have a wheat crop of from forty to fifty million bushels in the Lethbridge district this year. If that is the case the same situation will be repeated that occurred in 1915, and all over that part of the country grain will be standing in the stook all winter, and there will be a loss of thousands and thousands of dollars to those farmers. Now I am going to make this appeal to the government. I am not finding fault with these elevators. If they need that elevator at Edmonton in order to facilitate the shipment eastward or westward—

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is there any reason why the farmers in the West cannot have granaries to take care of their grain?

Mr. JELLIFF: It is impossible to build granaries in the condition we are in to house all that grain. The condition is largely one of car shortage, and that can only be met by giving your rolling stock a shorter journey, letting them run back and forth to the internal elevator, for in that way they give ten times the car service that you get when the rolling stock is moving 1,200 miles to Winnipeg or 780 miles to the west coast. That is the kernel of the whole situation. Now I am going to appeal to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture, who knows what that situation means to these mixed farmers to bring down a further Supplementary Estimate and provide for the construction of an elevator at Lethbridge.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let us get to bed and we will give you half a dozen elevators.

Mr. JELLIFF: I think the government is the cause of the lateness of the hour and not I. I sincerely beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, for delaying you so long but this cause is one that has been dear to my heart for the last twenty years. It is time it was attended to, and attended to right off. I appeal to the Prime Minister to bring down a further Supplementary Estimate and build that elevator.

Mr. ROBB: Into the division of opinion as to Edmonton and Lethbridge, I am not going to enter. It is only fair to my hon. friend to say that he has urged upon the government the construction of an elevator at Lethbridge, and as I listened to his speech to-night it almost seemed as though we were back in other days because I can recall when the former member for that constituency, Mr. Buchanan, had tried with equal force to impress upon previous governments the importance and necessity of an elevator at Lethbridge. But another thought came to my mind when my hon. friend was speaking. Listening to the account of the crop they had in his district last year, the crop they expect to have this year, and the number of cattle and sheep they have, it occurred to me that the hard luck stories we have been hearing have not been quite well founded.

Mr. JELLIFF: If I may interrupt, I may say that some time ago the Lethbridge Board of Trade prepared a statement as to the situation last year. One copy was presented to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a second to the Prime Minister, and the third to the Minister of the Interior. The facts which I have recited as to last year's crop are given there. They were carefully taken from the Canadian Pacific Railway records and I am very sure they are correct.

Mr. ROBB: I do not dispute that. I am quite of that opinion.

Mr. JELLIFF: I do not think I painted a very gloomy picture myself. I believe there is the very greatest hope for the future of

Alberta, although we did have two or three seasons there when we ran badly behind.

Mr. ROBB: It is true there are three railways running into Edmonton to fill the elevator there, but the door has not been closed to Lethbridge. In order that my hon. friend may take something home, I may say that the Grain Commissioners have promised to review the whole situation and make a recommendation to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. JELLIFF: Just a minute. I want to point out to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the situation was very carefully canvassed out there years ago by the grain commission. The facts are all known; there is no need of any further investigation. Lethbridge has been side tracked without reason, and I hope that the Prime Minister will do as I have suggested, bring down a supplementary estimate to help our cause.

Mr. CHURCH: I agree with what the hon. gentleman has said about the necessity for an elevator for this district. Additional elevator accommodation is needed for the whole of Canada. We are behind the times in that respect. I also agree with what has been said regarding the dire need of a terminal elevator in central Ontario. In the debate the other night I read the remarks of Mr. Julius H. Barnes, one of the ablest transportation and grain men on the American continent about the elevator capacity of this country and the United States. This statement, which was published in the last month's issue of the National City Bank shows that the elevators across the border, from Dakota right down to Buffalo are congested and cannot contain any more grain. We are going to be in the same position in this country unless additional elevator accommodation is provided. What is needed for Canada is a big, forward elevator policy which will provide for elevators all along the great lakes and the St. Lawrence. On the 2nd of May, 1919 a deputation came down to Ottawa to interview the government. I prepared a memorandum for the deputation which was laid before the government of the day. Mr. Manning Doherty, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, was present on that occasion, with representatives of the United Farmers of Ontario, the United Farmers' Co-operative Company, and representatives of the grain trade.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the item relates to the elevator at Edmonton, and that what he is saying is not relevant to the question.

Mr. CHURCH: But you have allowed the hon. member for Lethbridge to urge the need of an elevator in that district.

The CHAIRMAN: That does not make any difference.

Mr. CHURCH: We have as much right to urge the establishment of an elevator for central Ontario as the hon. member in question has to argue in favour of an elevator for Lethbridge. The government must adopt a forward and progressive policy upon this elevator question.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of policy at all.

Mr. CHURCH: I have a memorandum here but I do not wish to read the whole of it. It urges the need and utility of a terminal elevator, such as is being built in Edmonton and Halifax, in central Ontario. There was an election the other day in the province of Ontario and one of the main questions argued at that time was the need of these elevators.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN: I must again draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is out of order.

Mr. CHURCH: Surely I am in order in making a few quotations from the memorandum. We were told that when the estimates for the construction of elevators were brought down opportunity would be afforded for a discussion of the whole elevator policy of the country and yet we are not to be permitted to discuss it. I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce when his estimates were before the House, and we would not have allowed those estimates to go through so quickly if the minister had not promised to afford me an opportunity of bringing the need of a terminal elevator in central Ontario before the committee. I shall only occupy four or five minutes. An elevator is not a luxury; it is a necessity.

Mr. CAHILL: I must rise to a point of order. The hon. member has been out of order for some time. If he wishes to appeal against the decision of the Chair he may do so by calling for a vote of the committee, otherwise he is entirely out of order. If the hon. member does not call for a vote let us pass this item and proceed to the next one.

Mr. TOLMIE: It is only fair that the hon. member for North Toronto should be afforded the same opportunity as the hon. member for Lethbridge who spoke on the

necessity of an elevator in his section of the country. The hon. member for North Toronto is giving reasons why there should be a terminal elevator for central Ontario.

The CHAIRMAN: The difficulty is that the hon. member cannot move a capital expenditure or a public charge. The distinction is that the hon. member for Lethbridge was suggesting to the committee that, instead of the Edmonton elevator there should be a provision for the construction of an elevator at Lethbridge, for that same province, but in a different part. In this debate the hon. member for North Toronto is speaking of the establishment of elevators and the general policy of elevator construction in Ontario which is altogether different.

Mr. CHURCH: I may say that Ontario produces approximately 200,000,000 bushels of grain annually. In 1919 that total aggregated nearly 225,000,000 bushels, but this was an exceptionally favourable year for grain crops. It will be seen that in the average year Ontario produces enormous quantities of grain. A very considerable quantity of this grain is used for live stock feeding as the live stock industry is a prominent one in the province of Ontario. At the same time there is no doubt but that millions of bushels change hands each year the grain being sold either in the local trade, in interprovincial trade, or for export. At the present time there is no government interior terminal elevator in the province at which grain may be officially weighed and graded, as is done in the other provinces. At the present time the Grain Commission is endeavouring to purchase over 500,000 bushels of oats in Ontario, but there is no central point at which this grain can be officially assembled, weighed and graded. The absence of these facilities in Ontario has proven a loss to the farmers, a great inconvenience to those engaged in the grain trade, and a handicap to the province in competing in these lines with other provinces which have the benefit of such facilities.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): When the Chairman of the committee rules an hon. member out of order, there is no justification for the member disregarding the rule. If the member wishes to apeal from the decision of the chair, he can do so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With regard to the point of order, I am a litle surprised that the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) should be permitted to discuss the situation with regard to Lethbridge, because it is a little nearer to Edmonton than the points the hon. member for Toronto wishes to discuss. I can hardly conceive of such a provincial idea creeping into a discussion of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that there is a rule of the House that the judgment of the Chair cannot be criticized when it has once been given. I do not think a point of order was raised with respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Lethbridge.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. member for Lethbridge spoke at considerable length.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What is the point of order? I do not think this item has been passed. It is still before the committee, and we have a perfect right to discuss it. The objection raised by the hon. member for Lethbridge with regard to the item of $200,000 for an elevator at Edmonton was based on what he contended was the advantage of having an elevator capacity in western Canada, that would permit short hauls on the railway to those elevators. The same arguments might be used in other parts of the country, and I am surprised that this provincialism should be drawn so strictly that we are barred from discussing that question, but I am not going to dispute the ruling of the Chair. I have respect for the rules of the House, and while I may differ, I am going to strictly confine myself to the item before the committee with regard to the building of a $200,000 elevator at Edmonton. The member for Lethbridge argued that the short haul would enable so many cars to be used. This is an old question in this country. The western farmer has been contending for years that he should have cars available as soon as he threshes, in order to take care of his grain; consequently we are bound to have a car shortage at certain times in the year, and now we are asked to meet this condition, to enable those people to avoid this cost. The people in Ontario have always had to take care of their grain, and I believe that if the farmers in western Canada would pursue the policy carried out in other parts they would not have as many difficulties as they have to-day, and you would not find a glut of wheat on the market at one time, and then for several months nothing for the railways to do. Western farmers are not able to take advantage of the market to the same extent that they would if they were carrying their own grain, as the farmers do in other parts of the country. It may be said that, owing to the immense quantities of grain grown by the farmers in the West, it is absolutely impossible for them to do it.

Mr. LOVETT: I thought the hon. member for North Toronto had the floor?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the hon. member has any question to ask I will be glad to answer it.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh no, you will talk all night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not know that the House is called on to pay any attention to what the hon. member thought.

Mr. LOVETT: Exercise a little courtesy and give the member the floor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. member for North Toronto is quite capable of taking care of himself.

Mr. LOVETT: He has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This item of $200,000 is just another example of what has been done particularly with regard to the estimates which are now before the House. I question if there has ever been a more glaring example of an attempt being made to satisfy certain sections of the community, without regard to the public interest, than we have had in regard to the estimates passed by this House to-night, which have been jammed through. We have sat till broad daylight, and the government is still endeavouring to crowd these estimates through. An item of $200,000 in the supplementaries is altogether too large to be passed in this manner. There was ample opportunity to have these items passed in the main estimates, if it was desired to put them through, or if there was any justification for putting them through. The fact that they appear in the estimates in the dying hours of the session indicates that they are not items such as should be passed by this House without reasonable discussion.

Mr. CHURCH: As I understand the ruling on the point of order when an item relating to a post office is before the committee you can discuss the needs of any post office in another part of the country. Now, I am not preventing the committee from rising. I would have been glad to see the House rise two months ago. We have tried to play the game with the government and we have done our best but we do not want anything unfair. The counties which are asking for this particular item are Liberal counties and have gone Liberal. Regarding these particular elevators at Edmonton and at Halifax, I would like to ask the minister one or two questions. I think it is necessary when an elevator is to be built that it should be constructed in the proper place. Some mistakes have been made in erecting elevators in certain localities. Can the minister tell the committee whether these elevators will provide sufficient accommodation for weighing, drying, cleaning, storing and grading of all kinds of grain in Nova Scotia and Alberta? Second, will they be of advantage to individual farmers of those two provinces by enabling them to ship carload lots of grain which would be officially weighed and stored and for which there would be issued an official certificate which would be recognized by the bank at once, thus broadening the farmer's market, and will similar accommodation be available to the grain trade? Another point in connection with these elevators is this: Will the erection of these two $200,000 elevators provide facilities for the storing, cleaning and grading of different kinds of seed? This would be of great advantage to the farmers of Nova Scotia and Alberta, particularly with reference to grass and clover seed. Will they be of much advantage to the live stock industry of those provinces by facilitating the distribution of feeding stock from one section to another in the case of short crops in the local districts or in the provinces as a whole? Will these elevators be able to perform a distinct service in preventing the deterioration of certain crops in the provinces in years of too much moisture, as was illustrated in the bean crop in recent years? The crop of buckwheat in one year had to be dried because of wet weather which prevailed at the time of harvesting. Special emphasis, I might say, should be laid on the fact that such an elevator as these two elevators, should be a public elevator, and certificates should be issued that would be official government certificates, both of which are advantages affording great protection to the public and not available in the same sense from private enterprise.

From the commercial side, I believe these two elevators may be a success. I am not speaking in order to kill time. I appreciate the work of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Mr. Robb). I think he has been a very fair minister. He has no doubt been very busy in the past, and I should like to be fair to the ministers because they are overworked. I should like the Minister of Trade and Commerce to come up to Toronto, meet the United Farmers, the Harbour Commissioners, the Peterborough people, and the other people interested in this matter and see if something can be done to relieve the situation.

At flag stations, throughout central Ontario, the railways will not take the crops, there is a great hardship owing to lack of these facilities. For that reason I presented this memorial, which I hold in my hand, to the government in 1919, but not a thing has been done since. The central counties of Ontario, the Yorks, Peel, Brant, the Simcoes, and many other counties have no way of putting their crops into cars at a railway station; they have no place to leave their crops and in some cases they are rotting in the ground for lack of transportation.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Little Anse—In full and final settlement of T. D. Morrison's claim in connection with contract for construction of a breakwater, $3,234.60.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Last evening this item stood on account of the fact that I did not have before me full data in connection with the matter. The committee is aware of the circumstances under which I was dealing with the estimates. The situation regarding this matter I will put very briefly before the committee. Mr. Morrison obtained a contract in 1911-12 for the construction of a breakwater at Little Anse. He had proceeded with the construction of the work, and it had been completed, when on December 28, 1912, one of those abnormal storms and, in fact, gales which sometimes sweep the eastern coasts of our country, came up and destroyed the outer end of the breakwater. In the contract which he had signed for its construction was a clause providing that the contractor was to take the risk of a storm. He proceeded to replace the part that was destroyed, and then he made a claim upon the department asking that he should be compensated for this extra work which he was compelled to do by reason of the storm. The engineer at that time, Mr Bernasconi, took the ground that by reason of the strict terms of the contract no allowance should be made to him on account of this. The next year, 1913, a broader construction was placed upon contracts under conditions like these. The department, in the case of a contract at Devil's Island was authorized by order in council, to pay the contractor $4,813, to compensate him for the extra work which he was compelled to do as a result of the storm. In the next year, in a place called Sandy Cove, a contracting firm called John E. Bigelow & Son was paid amounts which together reached $1,995, under exactly similar circumstances. Again at Dipper Harbour and again at Three Fathom Harbour, amounts were paid by the department to contractors whose work had been destroyed by storms. The Department of Public Works proceeded to change the form of contract by which the liability occasioned by result of abnormal gales was taken from the contractor and admitted by the department.

This contractor, Mr. Morrison, then came to the Department of Public Works and asked that his claim should be reviewed. It was considered by Mr. Locke, who was second in command amongst the engineering staff of the province of Nova Scotia. Mr Locke, reviewing the whole circumstances, held that this storm of 1921 was an absolutely abnormal one, one which could not have been contemplated at the time the contract was made, and his report winds up as follows:

I, therefore, beg to report that Mr. Morrison's claim for extras be allowed and as to what the amount of this claim should be I respectfully submit the following figures:

He goes into details and makes the figures to be $3,234.60. Going into the matter in detail, he further concludes:

I would, therefore, recommend that Mr. Morrison be paid in connection with this work the additional sum of $3,234.60. As to the question of whether interest should be allowed or not for the nine years which have expired since that time, I consider this a matter for the higher officials of the department to decide upon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of that report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): June 27, 1922. Then Mr. Dodwell who has been Chief Engineer of Public Works in Nova Scotia for the last twenty-five years, a man of long experience who has served under every government, appointed originally by the government of Sir John Thompson and who has been an official ever since, reviewed the claim of Mr. Morrison. Speaking of the conditions he said:

The evidence goes to show that this was a storm of extraordinary and almost unprecedented severity. It was a whole gale from the S.S.E., the direction of greatest exposure, and it was accompanied by a tide or tidal wave of a height unknown for many years.

He went on to say:

It is true that Morrison's contract explicitly provided that he would be responsible during the whole period of the construction for all damage done thereto by gales, storms and other causes, and no relief from responsibility is given or implied in the case of a storm of extraordinary or unprecedented magnitude. That this provision in the form of contracts in vogue in 1911 was deemed of an arbitrary or unfair severity is shown by the fact that in contracts of later date, as for instance the one at Sandy Cove, clause 21 of the specification provides that the contractor is responsible for all damage . . . . . "excepting in such cases of an uncontrollable action of nature which it would be impossible to guard against." It is admittedly difficult to draw a line between an ordinary storm doing damage that the contractors must make good at their own expense, and an extraordinary one with its resultant damage for which a contractor is not liable.

but if we suppose that the breakwater at Little Anse before its completion had been damaged or destroyed by an earthquake, the department would hardly be justified—not in equity at least—in penalizing the contractor for such a catastrophe.

After a careful and thorough review of the circumstances of this claim, I find myself unable to reach any other opinion than that Mr. T. D. Morrison is fairly and properly entitled to be paid the amount of damages estimated by Mr. Locke in his report attached hereto at $3,324.60. If, moreover, he is entitled to this amount as principal, he would also be entitled to interest and the amount payable to him would therefore be

Principal..	$3,234 60
Nine years' interest at 5 per cent.. ..	1,455 57
	$4,690 17

Here is a case in which the two leading officers of the department have recognized the claim. I am aware that Mr. Bernasconi in 1920 reported against the claim. He was a young man and a junior engineer who had charge of the construction, and he reported, on account of the contract at that time making the explicit provision in regard to the liability of the contractor, that he was prevented from considering the claim. But inasmuch as my hon. friend's government changed the form of contract and allowed in proper cases in which the evidence was clear that the work of the contractor had been destroyed by storms of unusual severity, that compensation should be made, the minister of this department felt that he had a right to ask that the money be paid. I submit with absolute confidence, after going through the records and speaking not from any legal standpoint but with full responsibility as acting minister, that the vote is justifiable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is a very good kind of case for discussion, because it shows what can be done if a minister wants to put through a supplementary estimate. One of the best things to do is to bring in witnesses afterwards who knew nothing about the facts at the time. For example, if you want to obtain a different decision from the one that was previously arrived at just send an engineer who was not originally on the work, and have his report considered by some one who was not the original engineer either.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Both Mr. Locke and Mr. Dodwell have been in the service 25 years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not say anything to the contrary.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend spoke about sending an engineer down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly; they were sent to look into the claim.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Locke was.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now I am going to try to get at the facts. This contract was entered into in 1911 or 1912 and the report on the storm was made on January 7, 1913. There was no claim put in for damages as a result of the storm; at that time no reform politician had come upon the scene to tell this gentleman that he might get his claim settled. The final estimate under this precious contract was given on August 27, 1913, and in that final estimate there was an allowance for $300 extra, the original contract being for $21,500. These extras were accepted, and the first reference I find to any claim appears in the file on the 29th of July, 1920. The claim was referred by the then minister to the local engineer, Mr. Bernasconi and he reported upon it in the ordinary way. The district engineer reported against the claim on October 22, 1920, to the chief engineer, Mr. St. Laurent, who endorsed the report. The report of the chief engineer is dated November 8, 1920, and a letter was written to Mr. Morrison refusing his claim on November 10. The next thing I find is a letter from the initial engineer to the minister who at that time was the Hon. Mr. McCurdy. The matter was again considered and referred to the engineers, and again on March 14, 1921, a letter was written to Mr. Morrison stating that his claim could not be acceded to. Then a long petition is worked up winding up with a statement that is forwarded "through our worthy and popular representative Mr. George W. Kyte". When this petition comes in Mr. St. Laurent gets hold of it in the first instance. The memorandum filed by Mr. St. Laurent on the 21st of April, 1922, is against the claim, and so it is necessary, of course, that there should be a new set of engineers, if this claim, which never really existed at any time between 1913 and 1920, was to be made alive. There were therefore two other engineers whose names we have heard. Now there is only one thing I can say about this matter. The claim had been refused regularly by engineers that were familiar with the whole thing, and it was declined when appeal was had to the former Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MARTELL: Was the engineer who recommended it a senior engineer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The engineer who did not recommend it was the chief engineer. There is just one moral to be drawn from the whole matter and that is as to what politics can do.

Mr. MARTELL: You are measuring every one by your own half measure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all. The minister talks about a compassionate allowance. When he first introduced the matter he said, in answer to a question, that he fancied it was because Mr. Morrison, the gentleman who happened to have the contract, was a Liberal and his hon. friends who came into power in 1911 did not want to recognize the claim although it was perfectly legal. That is the kind of hypothesis on which the minister has acted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): We have lots of precedents for it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So far as any legal claim is concerned, of course there is none. How easy it is to be generous with somebody else's money—that is the whole moral of it all. What justification the minister of Finance can put forward for a claim of this kind, standing under a contract made in 1911; what justification he has for bringing it up in the supplementary estimates, absolutely passes my understanding.

Mr. SHAW: I have not heard the previous discussion in connection with this item, but it is rather peculiar that a claim so long out-lawed as this can now be resurrected. If the circumstances narrated by the ex-Minister of Finance are correct, this claim would look very suspicious. Apparently it was rejected by the department during the regime of the late government, and now it is resurrected. The minister suggests that after giving it careful consideration he comes to the conclusion that there is a legal claim. If the contract provides that the responsibility in the case of the eventuality mentioned rests with the contractor, how can legal liability now be imposed on the government?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The construction placed by the government on contracts of that kind is that that is the proper course where there is the intervention of a storm of unprecedented severity. The ex-Minister of Finance has given a very jaundiced and distorted version of the facts, and he impugns the engineers who made the reports and who have been in the department for twenty-five years. Mr. Cameron, Acting Chief Engineer for the Department of Public Works reviews the whole case, and he cannot be accused of dealing with the claim in any way other than what he thought was proper.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When was Mr. Cameron's inspection made?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He made no inspection.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then how could he report?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He is Acting Chief Engineer for the department. Contracts of all classes come before him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, my hon. friend said I had given a jaundiced version of the facts and that I have made misrepresentations. Wherein did I make a misrepresentation?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend's speech was one continued accusation that this was a matter of political dealing by the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then let us get down to the facts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend cannot find any evidence of political interference with these engineers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend will tell me wherein my facts are wrong. The first engineer who reported was Mr. Bernasconi. The minister said that he always reported against it. Is that right?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes, but why? I know the young man; he had not had much experience and did not know anything about the law. According to his construction the contract did not permit of the interpretation that Mr. Morrison
6 a.m. was entitled to this money. But he admitted the facts; he admitted the storm and all that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He reported against it. Then Mr. St. Laurent went over it and also reported against it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He did not visit the work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Neither did the Mr. Cameron you spoke about. Mr. St. Laurent was chief engineer; he went over that report and found it was correct?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes. But what about Mr. Locke, who visited the place?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He went to the place, interviewed everybody connected with it, and made his recommendation at that time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The truth is that the one man who saw this at the time anything could be learned about it was Bernas-

coni. Then there was another storm, as shown by the file, on February 4, 1915, and the very next report my hon. friend can refer to is in 1916. So the man who knew reported against it; the chief engineer with him reported against it twice. As to the two engineers upon whom my hon. friend is basing his case, neither of them reported in favour of the claim, but the two new engineers did. Was I wrong in saying that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Two new engineers? My hon. friend has been talking all through this matter as if some engineers were dug up from somewhere and sent down to report on the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Two other engineers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Two regular engineers in the Nova Scotia district, Mr. Locke, and Mr. Dodwell, Mr. Bernasconi being an understrapper who undertook to construe the law. He agreed, however, that the storm was of exceptional severity, though he undertook to say that under the contract there could not be a claim. Mr. Locke, who was his superior, visited the place and ascertained the facts before making his recommendation. Mr. Dodwell is a man of long experience who was appointed under Sir John Thompson's government. My hon. friend's suggestion about politics is therefore perfectly ridiculous. Who in Nova Scotia would ever think of Mr. Dodwell being influenced in a matter politically in the interests of the Liberal party or anyone connected with it? My hon. friend's insinuation about the utilizing of engineers is wholly unwarranted. Mr. Cameron, the successor of Mr. St. Laurent, to whom the whole matter was referred, recommends to the minister, with a full sense of his responsibility, that he should go to parliament and ask for this money. Why should there be any question about it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are lots of reasons. When did my hon. friend send Mr. Locke down?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He was sent down by my hon. friend's government in 1916.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has my hon. friend the report from Mr Locke in 1916 in favour of this scheme?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes, it is here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like him to show it. In fact, if my hon. friend produces the file and leaves it here I can show him that there was no claim made until 1920, so what is the use of his saying that Mr. Locke went down in 1916 and reported in favour of it? If this be so proper and right and legal why does not the government waive any question of statutory limitation and give a fiat and let the man sue?

Mr. BUREAU: The fiat game is played out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it is. The money could never be collected in the world. Other people's money could not be given with the fiat.

Mr. BUREAU: That is an insinuation against the courts, that they are prejudiced.

Mr. KYTE: I am rather surprised at the unwonted heat displayed by my hon. friend from West York with regard to this matter. As to his suspicion that this is a political matter I desire to say what I stated when this matter was before the committee before, that Mr. Morrison is not a supporter of mine and was not a worker of mine in the last election. Mr. Morrison is a contractor in a small way. He belongs to my county, and the only interest I have had in the matter at all was because he was a resident in my county, and whether he was a Liberal or Conservative I would be very glad to make such representations to the department as would put his case in a proper light.

This matter was pressed upon the department for some time, but the information that I had was that they had not evidence as to the character of the storm which was represented to the department as being an unusually severe one. I went to the gentleman who kept the meteorological records in the county town of Richmond county, and he gave the information which satisfied the engineer that the storm was of an unusual character. At the present session of this committee we had a claim brought down by the Minister of Railways and Canals of $196,417.63, and my hon. friend from West York argued that it was an illegal claim and that the Minister of Railways had no right to place it in the estimates. His own leader sitting beside him argued that it was an illegal claim, but strange to say they did not press it as strenuously as my hon. friend from West York is now pressing against this claim this morning. Note the distinction. In the one case the claim was for $196,000 made by a big contractor, whereas the man having the claim for $3,000 is only a small contractor. The small contractor apparently must be treated differently from the big contractor.

Mr. BUREAU: And they call that democracy.

Mr. KYTE: I do not know what they call that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend calls that logical?

Mr. KYTE: I call it inconsistent on the part of my hon. friend and his leader. I have nothing further to say in regard to the matter. It is a matter of absolute indifference to me whether the claim is paid or not. But this man did the work for the government and he suffered very great loss for a person of his means. Shortly after the government, in order to provide against such losses changed their form of contract and assumed liability for losses in respect of storms of that character. Is this man going to suffer loss because the change in the form of contract was not made a few months earlier than it was?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says that I showed unwonted heat. If anything was displayed it was displayed after the minister in charge of this matter accused me of unfairness. If heat was displayed it is then it was displayed. He is not quite as sympathetic and as good natured as our genial friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, and if people want trouble they can get it without very much trouble.

So far as my hon. friend from Cape Breton South and Richmond is concerned, I am surprised at him. I thought better of him than to think he would say we are only opposing this because it is a small claim.

Mr. KYTE: That is the inference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is a very poor drawer of inferences. This claim is something which has absolutely no legal foundation—absolutely none. My hon. friend is a lawyer, and he says, why should the man lose money because his contract was a hard contract and the form had not been changed? He signed it, and my hon. friend who is a lawyer knows he has no claim at all.

Mr. KYTE: My hon. friend said that the man who presented a claim for $196,000 had no claim at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Ah, but on the other hand—

Mr. BUREAU: He had the money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I believe the hon. Minister of Customs is speaking from the fullness of his heart and showing what would most influence him.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. BUREAU: I am never influenced by anything.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister had a very different story. He spoke of his own personal knowledge of the man, and he practically pledged himself to it, and besides that he had an affidavit which he said he could absolutely rely on. In this case no claim was made until 1920. Of course, as I say, it is awfully easy to be generous with other people's money, and all we can do is to protest. You cannot make a very much better case of it: contract, 1911; damage, winter of 1912-13; no claim made till 1920; passed upon by the department's engineers and thrown out; appealed from them to the former minister who had some regard for other people's money; the claim again thrown out; two other engineers sent to inspect; the claim allowed. I am going to ask whether the government have any objection to the file being tabled.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I shall have to consult the officers of my department with regard to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand there is any objection?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend has been browsing through the file the whole afternoon. I do not see why the department should give possession of a file like this upon which a claim is based to the Clerk of the House. I have not sufficient experience myself in the department to be able to say anything about it. I shall have to consult the officers of the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let me correct my hon. friend. He let me have the file not this afternoon but earlier, and he got it back. He has had a chance of going through it after I have. Can my hon. friend give me any reason why a public document when requested to be filed and on which this extraordinary action is taken cannot be tabled?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend will have access to this file in the department at any time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will undertake to see that he does.

Item agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is another matter a little more pleasant which I wonder if I could speak about now, Mr. Chairman, before my hon. friend the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establisment drops off again. I want

to mention a matter that I know must have been drawn to his attention before. I have received representations from a large number of very estimable societies in connection with the case of Mrs. Van Koughnet, a very estimable lady who did a tremendous amount of work during the war, who worked eight years for the government without salary at all, and who apparently has been released from her job without anything more one way or the other. The societies appear to be very indignant about it. They are certainly most sincere in their representations, and I would ask my friend what the position is.

Mr. BELAND: Mrs. Van Koughnet was the honorary superintendent of the Soldiers' Comfort branch. The activities of the department in the regular hospitals have greatly decreased, and it was thought advisable by the officials of the department in conference with me, that with a view to effecting economy in the service the branch should be merged with the regular activities of the department. The cost per year is between $30,000 and $40,000, and we expect to effect an economy of from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars by merging the two. Mrs. Van Koughnet has rendered valuable service in a very disinterested manner and it is a pleasure for me to render testimony verbally, as I have done in writing, to the work which she has performed on behalf of the returned men generally. She is not the only one in that category. Many other ladies in this country have rendered like service since the war in the same kind of work. I have taken occasion by letter to express my personal thanks, and those of the department, to Mrs. Van Koughnet for her great services.

Item agreed to.

Canadian Press, Limited—Canadian telegraph service, $50,000.

Canadian Press, Limited—British cable service, $8,000.

Mr. CAHILL: It is usual to pass such estimates as these during the dark hours of the night. The first of these items should properly come up in the dark rather than in daylight because it is undoubtedly a case of blackmail when the Canadian Press are permitted to take from the people of Canada the sum of $50,000 for a press service in this country. The second item of $8,000 for an Imperial or overseas press service is no more justifiable than is the $50,000 grant. I think the government are ill advised in voting $50,000 of the people's money for a press service, especially at this hour in the morning. I think the government should at least hold this vote over until we have had time to reconsider the proposition, and sleep over it; no harm will be done by deferring it until later in the day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we are all anxious to conclude the consideration of the estimates. These are the last items and there would be no advantage in holding them over until later in the day. The item of $50,000 is one which has appeared in the estimates for a number of years. No exception has been taken to it until this year when there was some reason to believe that possibly the Press more or less controlled a number of papers that might be entitled to news which, perhaps, they were receiving notwithstanding the government's assistance. I confess there was considerable doubt in the mind of the government as to the wisdom of continuing this vote in view of that circumstance. However, the government has gone carefully into the matter and, as far as we are able to learn, the immediate cancellation of this vote would simply mean that some of the smaller papers of the country would lose considerable news which they are at present receiving. It would make no difference to the larger papers; but we are told, and I believe on reliable authority, that a few of the papers in the Maritime Provinces and some in western Canada would suffer a considerable cut in the news they receive if that course were pursued. Under the circumstances, and bearing in mind the fact that this item appeared in the estimates before this matter came up for consideration, and inasmuch as the Press may have counted on it, the government has thought that for this year the item should be allowed to stand. However, I should like to intimate to my hon. friend that the government has decided that in subsequent estimates these amounts will not be included.

Mr. CAHILL: I should like to make just one thing clear. Since I have been in this House, and I entered it in 1917, I have always opposed this item in the estimates. The present leader of the government, who came in in 1919 I think, agreed with me in opposition to this amendment when we sat on the other side. The estimate ever since it came into effect has always been opposed by the Liberal party. It originated in 1917, and I never could see any justification for it. I never could see why the press of Canada should tax the people of this country to the extent of $50,000 in order to put over on the Canadian public the propaganda that they wish to put from year to year. I opposed this item when we were in opposition, I was opposed to it last year when it was voted, and I am opposed to it to-day. I think the principle

involved is a wrong one. I can see no advantage to the Canadian people in this vote, and if I have any support in this House this morning I will have much pleasure in voting against it. The Canadian Press have no more claim on the Canadian people than any other enterprise. I am sure that the members of the official opposition in the House will oppose this vote. I repeat the Canadian Press have no more right to a vote of $50,000 of the people's money to carry on their enterprise than any other business organization has. Not only should they be debarred this vote, not only should they fail to receive the support of the people, but they are a big combine in Canada. When the Liberal party applied for a newspaper franchise in Ottawa the Canadian Press told those who made the application they could not have it. This vote looks too much like blackmail for me to support it. I think the government are using bad judgment in voting $50,000 towards the support of this enterprise, and I shall oppose it.

Mr. HEALY: I am going to take up just a few minutes time in stating facts which I think should be made known to the members of the committee at this time. I do this because I personally was brought into the controversy in regard to the Canadian Press during the discussion which occurred when Bill No. 54 was before the House. Fortunately we have the report of the annual meeting of the Canadian Press, we have the official report of the gentlemen who are working for and receiving this donation from the people of Canada, and I wish to draw the attention of members of the committee to the attitude taken by the directors at their annual meeting. I wish simply to quote one clause from the by-laws of this association. The gentlemen who control the Canadian Press took it upon themselves to define the business conditions and public service that should govern in the granting of a new franchise. They say that such application should not be granted "except under conditions which, in the opinion of the Board of Directors are essential to commercial success, and lacking which no real, adequate permanent and satisfactory service can be rendered to the country." Two cases occurred this year in which the question of granting a franchise arose. The first was in my home city of Windsor, and finally, after a writ had been issued, after these gentlemen were to be brought before a judge and jury, after the facts were to be disclosed to the public, the franchise in that city was granted. The next case occurred in Ottawa when these gentlemen took it upon themselves to say that because the franchise in this city was owned by three individuals they would not grant a franchise to any other individual or company that desired to start a newspaper. These gentlemen have already received from the people of Canada the sum of $350,000. The government may feel that they are committed to the grant this year and perhaps it will be necessary in order to give these gentlemen a fair deal. This is a news gathering association. They gather the news at cost to themselves and they sell it at a tremendous profit to the public. For that reason I do not believe that the people of Canada should be asked to grant a subsidy year by year to this association. If the government feel it is necessary in order to be square with this association that the grant should be given this year, I am not going to say it should not be given, but I simply wish to point out that I do not believe the government, or parliament, or the people of this country, should be called upon to support what is really the creation of monopolies throughout this country. I will show how it works. I know of one company which owns a string of five franchises, and I know another which owns eight or ten franchises. In the province of Ontario when a man goes into a city and purchases two papers, he combines them into one; that gives him an absolute monopoly in that city, and the privilège of charging what he wishes for advertising and for subscriptions and it is a notice to the other newspaper men in this country that, for all time to come, no other paper can be established in that locality. It is absolutely an offence against British fair play and free speech. That has been carried to such an extent that an inside ring controls the Canadian press of this country. The great newspapers of Canada are not in accord with this monopoly, because when a writ was issued, and these people brought into court and were going to be placed in the position of being compelled to tell their sordid tale to a judge and jury, the great newspaper owners were men enough to say "Grant this franchise." I do not know whether it was the fear of the law or the desire for fair play of the newspaper men that caused them to grant the franchise in my own city.

Mr. SHAW: I am opposed to this subsidy, but in view of the fact that the government is going to grant it, I desire to say that I am informed that the association uses the Canadian Pacific Company as the means of its telegraph communication. Is there no way by which a large proportion of this sum might be used by our own telegraph system? The grant might be made subject to the use of the Canadian National lines.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not believe we will have a free press, if it is to be subsidized. There is a strong prejudice against this vote. There are many industries in Canada which have been driven to the wall and are not receiving help; but here is an industry which is self sustaining and yet coming to parliament for a subsidy. The people of Canada are sick and tired of this organization receiving a subsidy. They have never made out a case for it and it is wrong in principle.

Mr. CAHILL: If the rules of this House are carried out and the committee continues until 11 o'clock, and if no other member will take the floor between now and that hour I will attempt to occupy the time until then rather than submit to having this vote carried over my head. It is a wrong vote and never should have been authorized by the parliament of Canada. There never was any authority from the people of Canada to vote $50,000 to the subsidized press. There was never any authority for it from any government, let alone a Liberal government. I fought this matter when I was in opposition. I fought it in the country during my election, just as I have fought other things in my life, and I say it is not a Liberal principle. I want to tell the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister that Canada cannot afford to spend $50,000 of the people's money to subsidize the press, or to prostitute the news. This vote will defeat this government as it would defeat any government. We have voted many million dollars to-night, and every member of this government has attempted to justify the different expenditures; but not one has attempted to justify this expenditure. I ask the leader of the Government to try and justify this vote which is designed to prostitute the press of Canada. Can any minister defend it?

Mr. FIELDING: There are two items grouped together. One is an old item. It is for a cable service between Canada and England, established very many years ago. I remember the circumstances very well, because I had something to do with it. It was established in order that we might get a more efficient cable service between Canada and England, and I think in the early days it was certainly a useful service. We had been getting our news from the Old Country entirely by New York. It was coloured, and when things of Imperial concern occurred on the other side of the water we did not get a fair presentation of it. The press of that day proposed this arrangement and it was agreed to. I remember that the government of the day had nothing whatever to do with the control of the service; as a matter of fact it was in the hands of a gentleman now dead and gone, John Ross Robertson. He was an enthusiastic supporter of it. I think his brother conducted the service in London. In the main, I think the service was very satisfactory. It gave us what was a scarce article in those days, good reliable British news. That system has been continued to the present day. I have not had occasion to look into it of late, but I knew the circumstances when it was first voted. It was a wise vote. The other service was of more recent origin, and it was created when I was not a member of the House. I understand the purpose was this: There is a large section of country, a bridge, between eastern and western Canada, thinly populated, little or no population; and if there is to be an efficient service between eastern and western Canada some help should be granted. That is the argument for it. I think the object was a good one. My hon. friend speaks of it being a blackmail. I do not think that. I think the idea was that eastern and western Canada needed to know more about each other. Many of our western people who have come from the Old Country landed at Halifax, St. John or Quebec and went West at once by the Canadian Pacific without knowing anything of eastern Canada. We in the East know nothing of western Canada. It is, therefore, desirable that we should have an interchange of views. The bigger papers do not care for this; but if this grant will help the smaller papers to exchange the news and give the people a knowledge of what is going on in the country that they would not otherwise receive, there is very much to be said in favour of it. Whether or not it is a wise policy to continue this grant in the future, I am prepared to support it in the present session.

Mr. CAHILL: Who made the demand on the government for this grant?

Mr. FIELDING: I have not seen any human being on the subject. I am speaking from my knowledge of the public service.

Mr. SHAW: Would the minister be good enough to answer the request which I addressed to the Prime Minister, that is, whether or not the government will attach a string to this grant to see that the benefit of it accrues as far as possible to the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not mean not to reply to my hon. friend. The government is not in a position to know at the present time what contracts the Canadian press

has entered into for its communications. I cannot say at the moment whether my hon. friend's view is right or wrong that the Canadian press send their despatches over the Canadian Pacific line. I imagine that any arrangements they would have would be arrangements that would bind throughout the year. Under the circumstances I do not think the government would be justified in adopting the particular condition which my hon. friend suggests. Three months of the year have already gone by during which the Canadian press have had reason to believe that parliament would vote this amount. This is simply an obligation, perhaps not the most urgent in the world, but nevertheless one which the government should respect and having regard to the sum in the estimates, I think we should vote it at least for the present year.

Mr. SHAW: If there is any obligation, certainly the government must meet its obligations. But as regards the Canadian National Railways receiving fair consideration, I would like the assurance of the minister that that would be taken into consideration now, and if the grant is continued next year that due consideration will be given.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have intimated that it is the intention of the government to discontinue this grant at the end of the year, not to renew it.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the information of this government with regard to this vote? When did it originate? I understand in 1917 there was a vote of $7,000 or $8,000 for the overseas service. In 1917, when many of us had to suffer in this country, my hon. friends who are now occupying the opposition benches voted $50,000 to the Canadian press. For what purpose? For the pure purpose of propaganda, against whom? Against the Liberal party and against the people of Quebec, against my province. There is no justification for this vote in past history. There never has been any justification for a vote of $50,000 of the money of the people of this Dominion to the Canadian press. It was promoted by the Union government in 1917 and they could not justify the vote. I opposed it in 1917 and I have opposed it ever since. It has been proposed in this parliament from that time to this, and I think the government are making a great mistake to-day in again proposing it. They say that the vote has been going on for a few years. Is that any justification for the vote? Should the government not treat every estimate that comes before them on its merits? Should they not take the vote when it comes before them as a business proposition? No, they say that this vote has been in the estimates for the last five, six or seven years, and they propose to pass it now because it has been in the estimates in the past. Who is asking for this vote? The government do not propose to tell me. They do not know who is asking for it. This vote of $50,000 for the Canadian press is being proposed without any justification on the part of the government. The Liberal party of Canada a few months ago asked the Canadian press for a franchise for a Liberal paper at Ottawa and they waved their hand at the Liberal party and said: "No, we do not propose to grant you a franchise; we are a law unto ourselves." They did not grant that franchise. It was intimated, I understand, to the Canadian press that this appropriation of $50,000 might not be voted, but they said: "Oh, I guess it will; it is all right: we will leave it at that." The $50,000 item was not proposed in the main estimates, but it came in the supplementaries.

Mr. MACKENIZE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. It is in the Main Estimates.

Mr. CAHILL: It is in the Main Estimates, but it was not proposed before now.

Mr. MACKENIZE KING: It has been in the Main Estimates before the House.

The CHAIRMAN: This is two-thirds of $8,000 and two thirds of $50,000.

Mr. CAHILL: The Chairman of this committee should know better than to quibble about calling an item—

The CHAIRMAN: This item was called by me in the House one evening and was asked to stand.

Mr. CAHILL: This item was called for one-twelfth or one-sixth of the amount. It is well understood in this House that a proportion of a vote is not considered as a vote of the estimate. I told the leader of the Government that this was bad legislation and that I proposed to oppose it. I object to voting the money of the people of Canada and of the county of Pontiac to be given to the press that will not allow the establishment of free and independent newspapers throughout Canada. The press of this country should be as free as trade. You must have freedom or slavery. If you do not stand for the freedom of the press and freedom of speech, what do you stand for? You must have a free press and a free and a liberal government, or you have nothing.

Mr. McBRIDE: Let us have a vote on it.

Mr. CAHILL: Hon. gentlemen spoke at great length last night on the freedom of

Hindus, who are an infinitesimal proportion of the population of this country; but their freedom is of absolutely no account compared to the freedom of the press. If you are to be hobbled and bound by a press that is subsidized by the government to peddle news that is paid for you cannot be a free people. The leader of the Government knows that as well as I do. Let us get away from this bondage. Is the government afraid of the press of this country? If it is, I can tell the Prime Minister that the people are not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend and I talked this matter over and we know each other's mind fairly well, I think. It is not the intention of the government, I can assure my hon. friend, to renew the subsidy another year. The government has viewed the matter from all aspects in the endeavour to see that there is no injustice, or misunderstanding, or misrepresentation regarding its attitude, but we have thought it well to allow the vote to pass this year.

Mr. CAHILL: What justification is there for voting $50,000 of the people's money for this purpose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is very much in the interests of the whole Dominion that the various parts of the country should be kept in touch with one another. This subsidy has been used to distribute news throughout Canada to a greater extent than would have been possible but for it, particularly in the West and in the Maritime provinces. We are informed, and I think reliably, that if the subsidy were cut off immediately the effect would be very injurious, not to the large newspapers but to the smaller ones which would not receive that amount of news, concerning various occurrences in different parts of the country, which in the interests of the people as a whole should be circulated. I think hon. members will agree to let the vote go through when they realize the loss that would be involved in its withdrawal.

Mr. CAHILL: I am informed by some of the newspaper men of the country that the subsidy has not the effect which the Prime Minister suggests, of distributing news to the East and the West. In my opinion it is simply used as a threat to the smaller papers. The larger newspapers say, "If we do not get the subsidy we shall have to charge you a higher rate for the news service you get." I am also informed by people who I think are fairly conversant with the facts that the cost to the smaller newspapers would be a trifling matter, not more than $200 or $300 a year. This grant, or dole, or subsidy, has been opposed by some of the newspapers of Canada for a great many years.

Mr. SHAW: I wonder whether the government would consider the advisability of allowing this matter to stand until the next sitting of the House. It is getting so near the breakfast hour now that it might be well to postpone the matter until we meet again.

Mr. CAHILL: I am willing to allow it to go over until eleven o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a Supply Bill to follow which it is absolutely necessary to get to the Senate. That Chamber is meeting at eleven o'clock, and, if I may be permitted the remark, I think the object in view is to dispose of Supply now.

Mr. CAHILL: There are no items in the Supply Bill except this one. All the other items of supply are in the Supplementary Estimates. I do not see any necessity for rushing this matter now; it could very well stand over until eleven o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU: What would be gained?

Mr. CAHILL: That is for you to answer.

Mr. BUREAU: Then my answer is that nothing would be gained.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend is a poor guesser.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not a guess, it is a question of fact.

Mr. CAHILL: He has proved so in the past and I should not be surprised if he were the same in the future.

Mr. BUREAU: Fortunately I know your judgment.

Mr. CAHILL: Just as I know your inclination.

Mr. BUREAU: What is it?

Mr. CAHILL: There is nothing to be lost to me in pressing this objection. I am speaking purely on principle.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. member want to keep the House sitting until eleven o'clock? If he does we are prepared to stay.

Mr. CAHILL: If the government is going to continue to vote money at this rate they will find themselves in a very difficult position. I have not heard any reason why this vote should be in the estimates. What is the benefit to the Canadian people? Is it proposed to propagate the idea of the protected interests, of the financial interests of this country? I asked the late government

how they justified a similar vote; they were not able to answer the question, and their failure to answer it was responsible to some extent for the result of the election of 1921. The people cannot afford to subsidize a press in order that they may be fed with the kind of news that the interests of this country wish them to be provided with. It is not legitimate; it is not Canadian; it is not free; it certainly is not Liberal. Every item of the estimates that has been voted, with the exception of this vote to the Canadian press, has had some justification and has been accompanied by some reasonable explanation. But this item should not be in the estimates. It should not have been voted in 1917. It should not have been voted in 1918, and I opposed it. It should not have been voted in 1919, and I opposed it, as members of the Liberal party did. It should not have been voted in 1920, 1921, and in 1922, and there is no justification for its appearance this year. The people of Canada are suffering from excessive taxation, from business depression, and from bad conditions generally, and they are not prepared to sanction additional taxation for the benefit of the newspaper publishers of this country. They are willing to bear the burden of taxation provided that the purposes of that taxation are legitimate. They felt that the Liberal party would, when they came into power in 1921, give them a new deal, give them less taxation, bring about better conditions, and they are still hopeful that conditions will be better. But with the present newspaper propaganda they are beginning to doubt, and that doubt is increased when they are asked by this vote to contribute $50,000 to the Canadian Press. I think the government should leave this matter over till eleven o'clock and reconsider it, and give this House some reason why this vote should be continued. If the elimination of this vote would work a hardship on the smaller papers I think the Minister of Finance should tell the House just how they would be affected, and how it would affect the dissemination of news between the East and the West and as between the different provinces. If the government wishes to give us this information as to the news service that is to be distributed among the different provinces I am quite prepared to hear their representations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think all the members of the House are anxious that we should prorogue to-day, and as there are still some measures on the order paper that have not been disposed of and which it is important should get over to the Senate as soon as the Senate reconvenes. I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

CONCURRENCE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I move that the resolutions reported this day be now read a second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions read a second time and concurred in.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 244, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act, 1919.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie):

That the said bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to committee of the whole with instructions to amend same by providing that the amount of any guarantees binding on the country given under the said bill be first included in the estimates and voted by parliament.

Amendment negatived on division.

Main motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 43, to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Senate have made several amendments to this measure, some of which I propose that this House concur in. The first amendment is to paragraph (c) of section 1 in which they strike out the words "or brewer" wherever they appear in that paragraph. Paragraph (c) is also amended by adding after the word "distiller" the following "under the supervision of the Department of Customs and Excise." The next amendment is one relating to placing the burden of proof upon the person with liquor in his possession. It reads as follows:

And where the person accused is a person duly licensed by the Government of Canada to carry on the business or trade of a distiller, the burden shall also be on him of proving that all intoxicating liquor imported by him is imported solely for the purpose of being used for blending with or flavouring the products of the business or trade of a distiller carried on by him in the province and that all intoxicating liquor

imported and kept by him in the province is kept in a place or warehouse which conforms in all respects to the requirements of the law governing such places or warehouses and that all intoxicating liquor imported by him is used solely for blending with or flavouring the products of his said business or trade.

To that amendment I propose that we should agree. The objectionable amendment is the one that relates to clause 5. The clause as it left this House provided that:

Upon receipt by the Secretary of State of Canada of a duly certified copy of an order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any province in which there is, at any time, in force a law vesting in His Majesty or the Executive Government of the province authority for the control and sale of intoxicating liquor in the province, or in any board, commission, officer or other governmental agency the right of selling intoxicating liquor in the province, requesting that the prohibitions contained in subsection one of this section be brought into force in that province, the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare the prohibitions of subsection one of this section in force in that province and the same shall thereupon be and continue in force therein.

The Senate have struck out that clause and substituted the following:

(5) Upon receipt by the Secretary of State of Canada of a duly certified copy of an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province in which there is at any time in force a law vesting in His Majesty or the executive government of the province authority for the control and sale of intoxicating liquor in the province or in any board, commission, officer, or other governmental agency, the right of selling intoxicating liquor in the province requesting that the votes of the electors may be taken for or against the following prohibition, that is to say:

"That the importation and the bringing of intoxicating liquors into such province may be forbidden."

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may proceed to take a vote on such question in the manner provided in section 152, and the provisions of sections 152 and 152a and 153 shall as far as applicable mutatis mutandis apply to the taking of such vote.

5b. If the prohibition is declared to be in force, the Governor in Council may by proclamation published in the *Canada Gazette* declare the prohibitions of subsection 1 of this section in that province, and the same shall thereupon be and continue in force therein.

To that clause I would ask the House to disagree. I therefore move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House hath agreed to their amendments to Bill No. 43, an Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act, with the exception of those made to subsection 5 of section 163 of part V of said bill for the following reason:

1. Because it proposes that the federal authority should impose an wholly unnecessary expense upon the provinces affected.

And that the clerk do carry this message to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

BOARD OF AUDIT ACT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 245, to Constitute the Board of Audit.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain?

Mr. FIELDING: The amendment consists of a mere verbal change.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE

SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (for the Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 102, to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: The House will recall the proposal that was made by the Minister of Justice in regard to the question of prohibiting other than the publication of betting information. The Senate have struck out that section and substituted therefor the following:

3. Section 235 of the said act is hereby amended by adding to paragraph (f) thereof the following:

(11) Imports or brings into Canada any matter, whether printed or in writing which from the nature of its contents or other evidence adduced is not a newspaper published in good faith mainly for the purpose of supplying news and comment, other than information intended or likely to promote, assist in or be of use in gambling, book-making, pool-selling, betting or wagering upon any race of any kind, fight, game or sport whether held within or without Canada and whether published before, during or after such race, fight, game or sport; or is not a magazine or other periodical published in good faith mainly for the purpose of supplying literature and comment, other than such information as aforesaid; but is intended or likely to afford such information as aforesaid; or

The effect of the provision is to prevent the importation of the paper known as "Racing Information." The amendment falls short of the provisions adopted by the House but in order that we may get the advantage of the prohibition it contains I would propose that the House agree to adopt it.

The Senate have struck out section 4 raising the age of consent from fourteen to sixteen years. They have also struck out section 5 with respect to carnally knowing girls between fourteen and sixteen.

They have introduced another amendment with respect to the percentages collectible in the case of money staked on race tracks, but there is no very material change from the law as it formerly stood. It is only to make more clear the intention of the law. The Senate have also added a very important provision by which there is given to a person who has been convicted the right of appeal upon grounds which never existed before. This measure had been very carefully drawn and followed the principle of the law which had been established in England with regard to the right to appeal in the case of persons who had been convicted.

Motion agreed to.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 232 to Amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

He said: The amendment which the Senate has made to this bill is the addition of the following section:

38A. The Senate or the House of Commons may respectively make regulations, from time to time, by rule or by order, rendering more stringent upon its own members the provisions of this act which relate to attendance of members or to deductions to be made from the sessional allowance.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 203 to amend the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.

He said: In connection with the three bills passed by this House relating to returned soldiers, that to amend the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act is not so long and not so important as that relating to the Pension Act. The Senate has made several amendments to this bill, but they are of the same nature as applied to the three different bills. The intention of the original bill was that in cases where the insurance policies had been refused for certain reasons and on account of certain regulations, the policies should now be issued without any question. The bill was prepared with that end in view. The Senate provides in the amendment to the preamble that only those soldiers with actual dependents may have their policies revived; and only in the case of deceased men having, at the time of their death, actual dependents can the benefit of insurance be availed of. When the amendment to the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act was under consideration in the House last year, some restrictions were provided for in the schedule which was attached to the act. On that occasion the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) moved that all applicants for insurance before the 1st January, 1903, having dependents should not be subjected to the schedule attached to the act. Originally the insurance was available to every returned soldier; but the main object was to provide insurance for the dependents of returned soldiers, and the same clauses of the original act, if they are perused, will tend to reveal that that was the spirit that permeated the

House at the time of the passing of the original measure. I think, as only 71 cases are involved, and as the majority of them had dependents when they died we can concur in the Senate amendments. I will therefore move accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY: It seems very regrettable that we should be called upon to pass this legislation at this hour of the morning and at this stage of the session. Asking the House to pass upon these amendments to the Insurance Bill is really not giving the members of the House, the people of the country and the returned men as a whole, the fair chance they should have. After one solid year's consideration of this question by a commission appointed by this government, this bill with others has been passed. Now it is returned to us in its present shape; and it does not seem right that we should be asked to pass it before we really have a knowledge of it. I do not wish to obstruct any legislation, but I desire to place my own personal views upon record in connection with the manner in which this legislation has been returned to us and the reasons given for it. It is a well known fact that these amendments have been made on account of the increased cost of administration and other reasons. I have not hesitated to attend the sessions of the committee and devoted my time to the consideration of these matters.

Mr. BELAND: There is no desire to press for the passing of the amendment before the House. The most important bill by far is the Pension Act, but I have no objection to postpone the consideration of the amendment until the next sitting of the House at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I was prefacing my remarks in a general way, in order to cover the three bills at once, perhaps extending over a little wider area than the insurance question. I do not wish it to be inferred that this legislation is being hurried through in any way; but I think adequate time should be given to this legislation. Whatever action this House takes, I wish it to be made clear in every way that I feel that I cannot concur in the changes which have been made. I simply wish now to cover, in a brief manner, some of my objections to this bill, and perhaps at the same time cover the amendments to the Pension Act. The principal reason, as I have gathered, for the changes which have been proposed is the expense of the administration, particularly in regard to the Insurance Act. After the country has gone to the expense of appointing a royal commission which went into the matter thoroughly and brought reports to this House,

it is only fair that members of the House should stand firm, and insist upon passing the bills as they left the House of Commons. Although we are in the dying days of the session, if it is necessary to stay another week or month I am quite prepared to remain in order to see that legislation which will be to the advantage of the returned soldier is enacted. I have followed with great interest the discussion during the night, and have noticed how the government, with the sanction of the House, have approved money grants, which probably are justified, for celebrations and monuments. I wish to assure hon. members this morning that there are throughout the Dominion of Canada to-day many walking monuments without any provision. I wish again to assure hon. members that the only way the returned men throughout the country have of presenting the different cases and of asking what they consider is within their rights, is through their united efforts and their organized method of procedure. I feel sure that the changes that are now taking place in the Insurance bill, the Pension bill, and the Re-establishment bill will not meet with the approval of this country, and this is going to continue in every way the dissatisfaction that at present exists. I am well aware of the attitude assumed by the present government and of the attitude assumed by the minister. I am well aware of the opposition with which they have met. On the other hand, while I hesitate delaying this legislation, I feel so keenly on the subject that I wish to place on record my views on this legislation, the changes that have taken place regarding the Insurance Act, and in respect to other changes that have taken place contrary to the findings of the royal commission and contrary to the sanction of this House of Commons. I do not wish to be a party to those changes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is desirable that there should be ample opportunity to discuss the changes made by the Senate to this legislation, and for that reason I think it would be advisable if we postpone further discussion at the present time and take the matter up at the next sitting of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite agree with my right hon. friend's suggestion, but it is also of importance that we get something; that the legislation ought not to be wasted in any way. I would assume the House would appoint managers to go into conference with the Senate, and we should make that provision at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

[Mr. Humphrey.]

SUPPLY

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It will take some little time to have concurrence to Supply moved and I think that if possible we should immediately complete the voting of the Supply. I therefore suggest that the House return to Supply.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Canadian Press, Limited—Canadian telegraph service, $50,000.

Canadian Press, Limited—British cable service, $8,000.

Items agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to ask the consent of the House to motions for concurrence. I beg to move the following resolution:

Resolved, that two-thirds of the amount of the resolutions reported from Committee of Supply from the 20th February last to the 20th March last, inclusive, forming a total of $33,540,785.30; and two-thirds of the amount of resolutions reported from Committee of Supply from the 27th March last to the 8th June last, inclusive, forming a total of $103,857,326.70; and two-thirds of the amount of the resolutions reported from Committee of Supply from the 11th June instant to the 29th June instant, inclusive, and forming a total of $41,477,010.06; granting to His Majesty amounts voted of the Main Estimates, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and resolution concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move the following resolution:

Resolved, that two-thirds of the amount of the resolution reported from Committee of Supply on the 13th April, 1923, providing provisional bonus allowance for the Inside and Outside Services of the Civil Service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1924, and forming a total of $3,666,666.67 be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

SUPPLY BILL

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1924, the sum of $196,870,229.79 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1923, the sum of $18,202,105.66 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 252 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal years ending respectively March 31, 1923, and March 31, 1924.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

HALIBUT TREATY

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

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House doth agree to their address to His Excellency the Governor General respectfully requesting that His Excellency will be pleased to transmit our joint resolution that parliament do approve of the treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America providing effective measures for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the northern Pacific ocean, which was signed at Washington on the 2nd day of March, 1923, a copy of which has been laid before parliament and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty acting for Canada by the plenipotentiary therein named, by filling up the blank therein with the words "and Commons".

Motion agreed to.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 190 to amend the Companies Act.

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

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

He said: The House reassembles at eleven o'clock. I think the Government is fairly safe in assuming that it will be possible to arrange prorogation for three o'clock in the afternoon. It is impossible to fix the time definitely, because there is no telling what debate we may have after we assemble at eleven o'clock. There are one or two matters to be taken up, but for the time being we might assume that prorogation will be at three.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 7.55 a.m. (Saturday).

[Mr. Fielding.]

Saturday, June 30, 1923.

The House met at eleven o'clock.

PENSION COMMISSIONERS

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): I beg to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada for the year ending March 31, 1923. The report for the previous year was laid on the table of the House at an earlier date this session.

REDISTRIBUTION

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr Speaker, I beg to move that the report of the Special Committee appointed to consider Bill No. 15, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons be now concurred in.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have not had time to read the report in extenso. I have only been informed as to its contents, and if my information is correct it merely is a report—

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps, for the information of the right hon. gentleman and the House, the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald), who laid the report on the table of the House on Thursday might give a brief explanation. I simply throw out the suggestion.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of being selected as chairman of the committee to which was referred Bill No. 15 to provide for a redistribution of seats in this House. I may say that the history of redistribution measures in this country has varied in later years from the practice in a previous period in our history. In days gone by the bill was prepared by the government of the day and presented to the House, and without reference to any committee it went through its various stages just like any other bill. It was treated as a government measure and the redistribution was described as a "gerrymander" of the seats on the part of the government.

In 1903 the procedure of dealing with the question of the redistribution of seats was entirely changed. The government of the day introduced a bill drafted for the distribution of seats generally, but with a schedule, to be filled in describing the various seats, their boundaries and names, this being left to a committee of the House to

settle by agreement. I think the committee in 1903 was made up of five members of the House, and the method by which the schedules were settled upon was by discussion, negotiation and agreement among the members of the committee. The bill was thus more a matter of production by parliament as a whole than by the government of the day. In 1914, when the next redistribution took place, a similar procedure was adopted. A bill providing in general terms for the redistribution was introduced into the House by the government, the schedule to be filled in. This was referred to a committee of nine representing all parts of the country and the parties in the House at that time. I had the honour of being a member of that committee, and well remember the procedure which was adopted. Sub-committees were appointed from the general committees made up of groups of two representing the Maritime Provinces, Quebec, Ontario, the western provinces and British Columbia. Each of these groups of two met together, and by discussion, friendly overtures and negotiation settled the boundaries of the various constituencies, discussed and determined the various units of population both urban and rural, and by this method agreed upon a measure which was presented to the House and adopted practically unanimously.

When the present bill was introduced this year by the government and referred to a committee of nineteen I foresaw immediately, with my previous experience, the difficulties that were going to arise in dealing with this question by arrangement and negotiation. Following the best methods, and in an endeavour to arrive at a consistent conclusion, the large committee was divided into sub-committees each composed of three members representing the several groups in the House. There was an exception in the case of the sub-committee on the representation of the province of Ontario. That sub-committee had a membership of six. In the several sub-committees the endeavour to arrive at an agreement met with some success. In the case of the province of British Columbia I think the points of difference narrowed down to a very small question. So also—although that was only ascertained at a very late date—in the case of the prairie provinces, with the exception of the province of Manitoba where there was a very sharp and marked difference of opinion amongst the representative of the several groups as to how the matter could be adjusted. In the case of the Maritime provinces the claim was made on behalf of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia that a minimum representation should be fixed in each of these provinces. The Attorney General of the Province of Nova Scotia and the representative of the Attorney General of New Brunswick appeared before the committee and advanced these claims and gave reasons why this proposal should be carried out. In the case of Ontario my colleague and friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Low) was chairman of the sub-committee. I may say that it did not appear that very much progress was being made with that sub-committee and this might be attributed to various reasons. In any event the representatives of the regular opposition, and our Progressive friends, claimed that the government should prepare and submit plans in detail for the redistribution of that province. There were a great number of adjustments necessary to be made in the case of Ontario but the government did not feel that it was their duty, in any one of these cases, to prepare an arbitrary or settled plan of division; that was left for each representative of each group to submit and to endeavour to arrive at a conclusion by negotiation. Ultimately, however, a plan was prepared by the hon. member for South Renfrew, and several meetings and continued discussion took place. I am not aware of what went on at those meetings, but as the provincial elections in Ontario drew nearer there were absences at various times from the sub-committee and the possibility of an agreement being arrived at seemed to grow "smaller by degrees and beautifully less" as the time went on. Then conditions arose, it seemed to me also as a result of the elections in Ontario, on account of which it seemed reasonable to suppose, having regard to the changes that had taken place, that the representatives of the several parties would not be able for a considerable time to arrive at an exact idea of what ought to be done.

Finally it was apparent that we were approaching the close of the proceedings of the House and that prorogation was at hand. The committee met as a whole and discussed the question very carefully and in a calm and deliberate manner. It was found at this time that two of the members from British Columbia, whose presence was really essential in order that we might get matters adjusted—the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) and the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork)—had returned to their homes, thus reducing the membership of the committee to seventeen. Now the question arose as to whether, in view of the near approach

of the end of the session it would be prudent to ask the House to prolong its sittings for the purpose of awaiting the results of the deliberations of the committee, which committee to my mind, speaking in the light of experience, had very little hope of arriving at an agreement; or whether we should report to the House and suggest that consideration of the bill should be deferred until next year. The result was that the committee decided that we should report to the House asking that the bill be deferred until next year.

I am aware that the suggestion has been made that deferring the bill until next year means some substantial danger or difficulty particularly to the western provinces where the representation is to be increased. For the information of the House, however, may I call attention to the experience in regard to the passage of redistribution bills in 1903 and in 1914 respectively. In the case of the former bill, the census which had been taken in 1901 was completed in 1902 and came up for consideration before the parliament which met in 1903. The bill providing for redistribution was not passed, however, until October 24, 1903, which is considerably later than is the present time. In the succeeding decennial period, the census was taken in 1911, and completed in 1912 but the matter was not dealt with by parliament until 1914. In other words, by a parallel illustration, if we were dealing with redistribution as in other years it would not be undertaken until the meeting of parliament next year. The bill of 1914 was introduced on February 10; it was referred to the committee, the final report by that committee was made on June 10, and the measure received its third reading on June 12. Thus it was that there was no redistribution in the last decade until a period a year later than the present period in this decade. Having regard to all the circumstances, it seems to me, and it appeared to the committee representing the various parties, that no injury or harm could arise by reason of the postponement of the measure for a year.

A fear was expressed that a general election might occur before the end of the year, and that parties entitled under redistribution to increased representation might suffer. There is no such possibility, to my mind, as a matter of law. Anyone who will read carefully the provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act will come to that conclusion, I think.

We have heard discussions about redistribution. Reference was made to promises alleged to have been made in 1920 and 1921, that there would be a redistribution before an election. Let it be understood clearly and positively that there is no way by which any redistribution can take place until the full and complete returns of the census have been made to the government. Hon. members will recall that in the session last year the Minister of Trade and Commerce told us, in the last days of the session, that full returns were not in at that time. But the suggestion that there might have been a distribution in 1921, or at any time anterior to the full completion of the census, could not possibly be carried into effect. Because section 51 of the British North America Act says:

> On the completion of the census in the year 1871 and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:

So that it is very clear that the census must be completed before the right of redistribution arises; and before it is possible to carry out the mandate of that section. Then there is a subsection which says:

> Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

Which means that any redistribution or readjustment of population made after the completion of the decennial census shall not come into effect until the next general election. I have no doubt—speaking with whatever experience I may have had in my profession and expressing a view in which I am supported by others with whom I have discussed the point—that if by any possibility the government of the day were defeated, or if they desired to have an election, it would be the bounden duty of His Excellency the Governor General to refuse the dissolution if any government asked for it after the completion of the census and before redistribution. It would be the duty, I submit, of His Excellency to say to any one who came asking for dissolution, that parliament must proceed to readjust and redistribute before a general election could take place. That is the position of affairs, apart from any other consideration. After full deliberation, I say that there need be no difficulty or no doubt in any quarter whatever as to the fact that no election can take place in this country, under the constitution, until after completion of census without redistribution first being completed.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, we have reached a stage of the session where the public business is completed and the time for prorogation has arrived. I think that the report of this committee recommending to

the House that this matter be deferred until next session is one which should meet with the approval of the House. Ten years ago redistribution was not dealt with until the session of 1914—not touched in any way. We have followed the same practice this session, and the session which will meet in the winter of 1924 will have to deal with the question. In the light of past experience in these matters, if the present motion is carried and report adopted, the question will come up to be dealt with next year. This is a matter quite as much for the House as for the government, following the practice and procedure adopted by the government, 20 years ago, 10 years ago and to-day of leaving the consideration of parliament as a whole the question as to what the redistribution shall be. It will be the duty of the House to seriously consider the composition and formation of the committee which shall deal with this question, if we are going to work out a bill along the lines of those adopted in the previous years.

In my opinion, the committee this year was too large to deal with the question along the lines on which it was considered, and it will be a matter for consideration as to how best to continue the system followed in the two last redistribution years, when Parliament, in the desire to do that which was right and proper and to give full consideration to the parties interested, got together and formulated a bill which was agreeable to all as far as possible. A great deal of information has been gained, and this data is in the possession of the secretary of the committee, and it will be open to all parties between now and next session to consider the situation. They can then come to parliament next winter with their data prepared, and their lines laid down, and they will be in a much better position to deal with the matter than was the committee which held meetings during this session. This session no party had any data or any map, and no one was prepared to deal with the matter in an effectual manner. All this can be obviated and these things put in proper shape, and any committee, no matter how it is constituted, will be able to deal with the whole matter in an effectual and satisfactory way.

It has not been the desire of the government in dealing with the question to impose any views on the committee. The whole question was left to parliament to deal with, unfettered by any political lines, and imbued solely with the view that we should make a redistribution of seats under the constitution which would be eminently fair to everyone. There were great difficulties met with in Ontario which cannot be minimized. There was a tremendous shifting of the population in the last decade. The population in some districts had increased in number while in others it had decreased. How to readjust the boundaries of the constituencies so that there might be fair representation for the rural and urban districts, without any discrimination against either, was a problem that was probably the most difficult that had to be faced by the representative of any of the provinces of the Dominion. The problem in Quebec was not so difficult although there was a sharp contrast and conflict of opinion in regard to one matter in that province. So also in Manitoba, difficulty was experienced. These things require study, thought and attention. It was a matter of great difficulty to proceed to redistribute the province of Ontario in a manner fair to all parties concerned without very great preliminary consideration, and attention to the claims which naturally attached to those who lived in the rural districts; that they should have a lower unit of population than those living in the city. There was the question of continuity of interest which existed among people who had lived in the same municipality for a great many years, there was the consideration that it is well not to disturb county boundaries, if you can possibly avoid it, because that was one of the rules laid down by all who had to do with redistribution in the past. These matters require careful study and thought, I believe, in the interim between the present session and the next session of parliament. If thought and study are given to the subject, no time need be lost in bringing forth next session a measure that will be satisfactory. Indeed, the time will be well spent by representatives of the different parties, knowing where the conflicting interests lie and the difficulties that were met with and will be met with. When we meet together again next year, we shall be able to solve the problem in a manner that, I think, it would not be possible to achieve without greatly prolonging the session. Supposing, with all the business before this parliament substantially disposed of, the suggestion were made that we should continue to sit awaiting the report of this committee, we would be sitting, in my judgment, for over a month, with the House having practically nothing to do in the nature of business, waiting for the termination of the squabbles, uncertainties and difficulties of the committee in dealing with a matter requiring so much thought and care as this does. Therefore, having regard to the fact that no general election can come on without this parliament proceeding to redistribute, to the fact that

the problem is one which requires care and attention, and to the further fact that a delay will result eventually, I believe, in producing a bill which will be in the interest of the country as a whole, I submit this motion is one which should be adopted by the House.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I wish to say a few words in connection with the report and the remarks which the minister (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) has just made. I was glad to note that the minister said that it was decided on division in the committee that the matter be deferred at this time. In looking at the report as it is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the 28th day of June, I find that it is stated in the third paragraph:

They therefore have agreed.

There is no mention of a division in that committee on the report as brought down to this House. The chairman of the committee, the minister who has just spoken, and all members of the committee know very well that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) and myself did dissent from that motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is quite right.

Mr. JOHNSTON: My reasons for so doing can be briefly stated. Every one knows that redistribution is due. As regards the prairie section of Canada, we are entitled to eleven more seats, and that is a big consideration. While the chairman has made the matter very easy for all members of the committee in his statement that certain work had been undertaken and something accomplished, I cannot share his view that anything like the amount of work that could have been accomplished was undertaken by members of that committee. In saying that, I want to be fair to all, and unfair to none. But members on the government side put in charge of the sub-committees were men with too much to do. Consequently, the sub-committees were never, or very seldom, called together, with the result that we never got down to the point of attacking the problem as it should be and will have to be attacked.

It is all very well to say that we have reached that stage in the session when every one is looking for prorogation. That is true, and no other hon. member is more anxious to get through and to return to his home than I am—I have been here for five months now—but as I said at the outset, redistribution is due. The electors of my province are entitled to five more seats in this House, and they are going to hold me and every other member from that province accountable for the fact that redistribution is not put through at this session. The minister says that there is no likelihood of an election. I do not know as to that; but I hope if this motion is concurred in and redistribution is put off, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will see fit to say to this House and to the country that, in so far as the government can say there shall be no election during the interval, or before another session is held and a redistribution bill is put through. But even with that I do not feel that I would be doing what my electors have a right to expect me to do, if I concurred in the report. There is a time for everything, and the time to redistribute the country is the present. I believe if the members of that committee got down to actual work, it would not take very long to put the bill through. I am not going to move in a formal way that this motion be not concurred in. I do not think that such a motion would get much support. I think I know the temper of the House, and I know that the majority of members with the exception of those of us in this corner who come from western Canada, are anxious to get away and would not support such a motion. But I do want to put myself on record as being opposed to concurrence in the report, and to say that redistribution should be completed at once.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, as I happen to be a member of this committee, and in view of the remarks made by the chairman of the committee and the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston), I feel that I could not very well allow the motion to pass without offering a few observations. I was a little surprised at the remarks of the chairman of the committee in endeavouring to make it appear that a good deal of the delay was caused by the attitude of the sub-committee for the province of Ontario. I must take exception to anything of that kind. The committee was appointed over four months ago. I think I can fairly state that no very serious attempt was made, for a long time after the appointment of the committees, to arrive at any understanding as to how redistribution should be brought about. I appreciate the difficulties of redistribution where the unit of representation is increasing by about 500 every decennial period, and some of the constituencies are decreasing in number, while other are increasing, so that a general redistribution will be necessary. It is somewhat

significant, that from the time that the committee was appointed, at practically every meeting of the committee, some reports were being given to the press as to how the proceedings were being conducted. The inference was left that certain members of the committee were responsible for the delay. This applied on several occasions, and I did not think, when the report, which was adopted at the last meeting of the committee and which is now before the House, would be discussed in the House, it would be necessary to refer to this matter in the way I find it necessary to do.

The sub-committee for Ontario were appointed and sent off to bring about a redistribution for that province. But the main committee did not come to any definite understanding as to how redistribution was to be brought about. Efforts were made to get the committee together on several occasions with a view to coming to some decision, and the sub-committeees were instructed to begin work. They did this, but, one province not having any relation to another, hon. members will realize how unfair and unworkable such a system must be. The minister suggests that the committee was too large and he thinks that possibly when parliament reassembles it may be advisable to reduce it in size. Personally I have no particular desire to be on the committee if I am not wanted, but I do think that some satisfactory arrangement ought to be made. The minister made the further statement that prior to the redistribution based upon the census of 1901 the constituencies had been more or less gerrymandered.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I did not suggest that this was the issue; I merely meant that the matter had been spoken of.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We finally succeeded in getting before the committee a proposition which, while I will not describe it by the word "absurd," undoubtedly was absolutely unworkable, as anyone might have expected. I do not think that very much progress has been made by the commitee. It is true that the Attorneys General of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, were heard with reference to the question of having a fixed representation for these provinces; but outside of that, very little work has been done and I think it is hardly fair for the Chairman to impute blame to any of the other hon. members of the committee. During the four months that parliament has been in session the sub-committees were called together several times, but on no occasion was anything attempted, and if the chairman of the committee had been as anxious to see redistribution materialize this session as his words would lead one to suppose, I think a considerable degree of progress might have been made. In view of the fact that we were almost unanimous I do not see that the near approach of the end of the session need have made it impossible to bring about redistribution after the last meeting, which was called on the 27th or 28th of this month. Nor can I see that the elections in Ontario had any material bearing on the situation. These, at any rate, are my views on the subject.

I had thought that the chairman would give an outline of what was discussed at the last meeting of the committee and that the matter would end there, rather than that the House should be left with the impression that the sub-committee for the province of Ontario was really the stumbling-block in the matter.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): I do not intend to say very much, and certainly I have no desire to reflect on any members of the committee. I believe that we were all somewhat slack, some hon. members more than others, by reason of pressure of work and the onerous nature of other duties to which they were compelled to attend. I simply wish to associate myself on this occasion with the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston), in the House as I did in the committee, representing as we do very directly those parts of Canada that would be most deleteriously affected in the event of an election being held before the realization of redistribution. I believe we were right in our contention, not that there was any great danger of an election, but because we should have been untrue to our trust, having had the interests of these provinces committed into our hands, had we not at least most vigorously protested against even the possibility of such an event occurring. The main reason for my rising just now, however, is to suggest that the report be slightly amended in order that it might conform more closely to the facts. Instead of stating, as the report does, that the committee "therefore have agreed" I would suggest that it state "therefore have agreed, on division."

Mr. JOSEPH T. SHAW (Calgary West): As a westerner I cannot help expressing my regret that, despite the apparently very strenuous labours of the committee over a period of four months, their efforts have so far been fruitless. The position of the committee was not such as would ensure of necessity that any redistribution measure would have been presented to the House; nor yet does the

fact that the sessions of the committee are held in secret assist in any way to bring about a conclusion. Personally I had very grave fear of the effect of these secret sessions, although I understood that it had been the practice for two preceding redistribution committees to hold their meetings in that way. I do not think that this is desirable. There would be a greater urgency to action if the meetings were held in public. I have no knowledge at the present time as to what the boundaries of Alberta were; I have no means of getting information unless from a secret source, and I am not prepared to secure it in such a manner. The fact that these sessions are held in secret necessarily increases the tendency towards political log-rolling. It is undesirable that the meetings of the committee should be held privately; they should be held in public so that anyone who desires to attend them may do so. However, I do not want merely to join in a futile dissent; I want to make a suggestion to the House which, not necessarily at the present time, but at some time in the future, may be of value. We have in this country a chief electoral officer whose duty it is to look after the conduct of elections. In connection with redistribution there are only two or three general principles which need consideration and determination. There is, of course, the matter of determining the census and the unit of population. Then there is the necessity for determining the difference between the unit for urban and the unit for rural representation. Of course a certain discretion must be exercised in order to preserve the existing county boundaries; that is to say, a discretion either to increase or to decrease, as necessity may require, the population unit so to preserve the homogeneity of the constituency. I suggest that the House agree, in public session here, upon these fundamental principles, and having determined them relegate the whole matter to an officer such as the chief electoral officer for determination. It would be a comparatively easy matter for him to undertake that work if he had the principles determined for him by parliament. which could be done in public. There is no necessity for political log-rolling, and it would be in the public interest that some such action should be taken.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In reference to the remark made by my hon. friend from Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) I would point out that, as already expressed by one or two members of the committee, the power of dissolution rests with His Excellency the Governor General and it would be impossible therefore for anyone to say how or when His Excellency might see fit to exercise that power. So far as the government is concerned I do not hesitate to say that I would, if consulted in the matter, advise His Excellency not to permit a dissolution of this parliament without first having enacted a redistribution measure. The government has no intention of bringing on a general election without a fair redistribution measure being enacted in the first instance.

Motion agreed to.

RIGHT HON. W. S. FIELDING

CONGRATULATIONS ON HIS BEING CALLED TO THE IMPERIAL PRIVY COUNCIL

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): I hope, Mr. Speaker, before the House closes the leaders of the three parties will express their appreciation of the honour conferred on the Right Hon. Minister of Finance in having been called to the Imperial Privy Council. No one is more worthy of it, and no one is held in deeper respect for the very courteous and fair way he has on all occasions facilitated the despatch of public business.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was informed, only a few seconds before the hon. member (Mr. Church) rose, of the happy fact to which he has referred. May I say, it comes as no surprise to me. Indeed, I have long felt that the delay in his being thus honoured must have been attributable more to his own reluctance than to any failure on the part of the authorities overseas to tender to him this honour.

Personally, and speaking for all those who serve with me in this House, I say that the honour is not only due but overdue. Long years of public service, both provincially and federally—a record of service which in point of time and of eminence of station has rarely, if ever, been equalled in the history of our Dominion—abundantly place him within the circle of those who are honoured by admission to His Majesty's Privy Council. I congratulate the Minister of Finance earnestly and sincerely.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted personally, and also on behalf of the group in this part of the House, to join in the congratulations to the Minister of Finance on his being made a member of the Imperial Privy Council. His has been a name to conjure with in this

Dominion for many years. He has a place secure in the history of our country, and not only now but in all the years to come the name of the Right Honourable William Stevens Fielding will be honoured. I have very much pleasure in extending my congratulations to him on this occasion.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no announcement could have occasioned more genuine pleasure to members on this side of the House, certainly none has given me more personal pleasure since the opening of this parliament, than the word received by cable this morning that His Majesty the King had honoured our venerable Minister of Finance by inviting him to become a member of the Imperial Privy Council. I think it will be apparent to all that not only has the minister himself been honoured, but that our parliament and our country have been honoured as well. I know I express the feeling of the House when I say to the Right Hon. Mr. Fielding that it is a source of great pride and great pleasure to us all that His Majesty has thus honoured him. We hope and pray that he may be preserved in health and strength for many years to enjoy this distinguished honour, and to remain a source of strength and inspiration to us all.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted, on behalf of the province of Nova Scotia, which regards the Minster of Finance as one of her most distinguished sons, to say to this House how proud we are of the distinction which His Majesty has conferred upon the right hon. gentleman. Few of our public men have such a long and distinguished political career to their credit, and few enjoy so fully the respect and confidence of their province. I wish to associate the people of Nova Scotia in these congratulations and to express the hope that the right hon. gentlemen may long be spared to adorn the public life of our Dominion.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the House that the Labour party adds its congratulations to those already tendered to the right hon. gentleman on this occasion. I do not suppose there is any public man in Canada who enjoys the respect of the whole country to a greater degree than does the Minister of Finance by reason of the great national services he has rendered. If for no other reason, I think the infinite patience which he displayed in the transactions of the Banking committee this session fully merits the hon. our which has been conferred upon him.

Right Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate more deeply than words can express the great kindness which is shown to me to-day by the members of the House. Politics has its troubles, its trials and its strife, but it has its pleasant side, and it is always a pleasure for me to think that amidst the hard fighting of politics—and I have had my share—I have always had the happy fortune of enjoying pleasant relations with the men who have differed from me as well as with those who have given me loyal support. I think it is quite possible to fight one's battles in an honourable way, to do the right thing for your own side believing you are doing it for the country, and at the same time win the respect and confidence even of those who differ from you. I shall not say any more than to express to my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition—with whom I have occasion once in a while to cross swords—to my hon. friend the leader of the Progressives, to my colleague from Nova Scotia, to my hon. friend also who last spoke representing another party, and last but not least to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, how deep a pleasure their warm appreciation has given me. I thank them sincerely for their good words.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINERALS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CHURCH: I would ask the right hon. the Prime Minister what disposition the government proposes to make of the fine report of the committee on Mines and Minerals relating to the coal question, and especially their strong recommendation as to the National Railways becoming busy by carrying coal at cost without any dallying?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The report has been adopted by the House, and certainly the government will take into consideration all its recommendations.

Mr. CARROLL: I may tell my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) that the report was concurred in by the House a few days ago, and I have no doubt the government during the recess will make it possible to carry out the representations which the committee has made.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 205, an act to amend the Pension Act.

Mr. KNOX: Have we passed the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker? We have no order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: On account of the long sitting yesterday the Orders of the Day could not be placed before hon. members this morning, but I am quite willing to send this one to my hon. friend.

Mr. KNOX: I had a matter that I wished to mention. Should I be in order, Mr. Speaker, in bringing it up now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I might make a suggestion to my hon. friend; the Minister of Soldiers' Re-establishment has some amendments to a bill which it will be necessary for the Senate to consider, and if it is agreeable to my hon. friend to allow that matter to be discused at once so that the bill can go across to the Senate, I will suggest to Mr. Speaker when the matter is disposed of that we return to the Orders of the Day to give my hon. friend an opportunity to ask his question.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): About ten days ago the House passed a bill intituled an act to amend the Pension Act. That bill had been carefully prepared. It was based on the recommendations of the royal commission which had been appointed to investigate the questions of pensions and re-establishment, and also to look into some charges that had been brought against the Board of Pension Commissioners. The bill as I introduced it in the House was rather a lengthy one, and contained two outstanding principles. The first principle was the restoration in the Pension Act of the so-called "insurance" principle as against the "due to service" principle. The second principle of the bill was that which provided machinery for appealing from the decision of the Board of Pension Commissioners. These, I repeat, were the two outstanding principles that were a special recommendation of the royal commission.

The bill passed this House, and so far as these two principles are concerned they were not affected at all by the action of the Senate. In the Senate a committee was appointed, and for a time we in this House were all more or less filled with apprehension that some radical amendments might be made to the bill which might destroy one or both of those principles which were contained in the original draft. Happily those apprehensions were not well founded. It is true that the Senate committee amended the bill considerably, and a copy of the bill as reported from the Senate committee was distributed yesterday to the hon. members of the House. Reading over that bill one would find, naturally, that the insurance principle of the bill had been done away with, but when the report of the Senate committee was considered in the Senate chamber last night the insurance principle was restored in the bill exactly as it was passed by this House. So, to make a long story as short as possible at this late stage, both of the principles incorporated in the bill as presented to this House have been preserved in the Senate. As far as the insurance principle in the awarding of pension is concerned, it is left intact as it was passed by this House. As far as the provision for appeal from decisions of the Pension Board is concerned, that has been altered, but not substantially.

The original bill provided for a district appeal board in every one of the nine units of the department, and also for a central appeal board. That was the recommendation of the royal commission. The Senate has amended that part of the bill in so far as it did away with the district boards as such, but has preserved the provision for appeal in the creation of a central federal appeal board composed of not less than five and not more than seven members appointed one-half for two years and one-half for three years. Provision is also made in the Senate amendment for members of that central board to come in contact with the appellants in every unit of the department. So if one stops to consider carefully the amendment of the Senate regarding the appeal provision, one comes to the conclusion that the privilege which had been secured for the men to appeal personally before the district appeal boards is preserved, inasmuch as a section of the central board will sit in the different units of the department. So, though I would have preferred that the district boards be preserved—that was the wish of the returned men generally I think, and also the recommendation of the royal commission—while I would have wished that provision to have been passed integrally I do not see any reason why we should not concur in the amendment, because the provision for appeal is preserved and the appellant in each case will have the privilege of appealing personally or through his representative before the appeal board.

Some other minor amendments have been made to the act which I think we can very well concur in, inasmuch as some of those amendments do away with provisions that were meant to more or less meet individual cases. The Senate, in doing away with some of those clauses that were passed during the consideration of the bill the other day, introduced in the bill a new clause which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House. Some hon. members are concerned about some individual cases which they claim are meritorious and in which pension should be awarded, but in the clause introduced by the Senate, hon. members will see, those cases will be dealt with notwithstanding the disappearance from the bill of some two or three small clauses:

> Any individual case which, in the opinion of the majority of the members of the Pension Board and the Appeal Board acting jointly appears to be especially meritorious and for which in said opinion no provision has been made in this act, because such case did not form part of any class of cases may be the subject of an investigation and adjudicated by way of compassionate pension or allowance irrespective of any schedule to this act

That provides for discretionary power, outside any other provision of the bill, to deal with those special individual cases of which there are one or two, I think, within the knowledge of every hon. member.

Now, I do not think there is reason to refuse to agree with the amendments the Senate made last night to the Pension bill as passed by the Commons. We have worked conscientiously in this House, I think, to provide legislation that would meet the reasonable requests of the men generally, and that would also remove some of the grievances under which they labour. I think it is my duty to thank the House generally for the support they gave me in this respect. I think I can say that nothing has been spared to render the situation as satisfactory as possible for the men who have deserved so much from Canada.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): I do not know that this is the time to discuss the various amendments that have been made to the bill, but if I am in order I want to refer to one or two points. In the first place, I do not think any member of the House has had the opportunity of scrutinizing the amendments made by the Senate, and which the minister has advised the House to adopt. It is very difficult, therefore, for me or any other member of the House to express an opinion as to whether or not these amendments will do justice to the soldier body. The minister made some point of a section which he read covering individual cases. The Senate has passed a provision which gives the appeal board and the Board of Pension Commissioners power to award a pension in meritorious cases. Now, while I do not doubt that the Senate and the minister have it in their minds to cover those meritorious cases, I am just as satisfied that they will not and cannot be covered by the amendment as introduced, and I will give an instance showing how impossible this is—either it is impossible, or else the example I am going to cite is not a meritorious case, one or the other. We will take, for example, the case of a man who died the other day and who comes from the constituency of the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke)—Private MacPhail—while this is an individual case there are hundreds of such cases in Canada to-day, and probably if they were all covered it would mean a considerable increase in the annual pension bill, not a material increase but probably an addition to the public expenditure of an odd hundred thousand dollars per annum. Private MacPhail was severely wounded in France, one of his eyes being shot out; and he was taken prisoner. He was operated on without chloroform by the Germans about eight days afterwards. He had no attention up to that time. Both eyes were removed and no anaesthetic was given him. Private MacPhail was one of the first men exchanged. He came back to Canada and was discharged more than five years ago. Now section 33 of the act provides that if a man dies more than five years after the date of his discharge his dependents cannot be in receipt of a pension unless his death is directly attributable to military service as such. But this man, like many others, died from some disease —I have forgotten what it was but his death was certainly not due to his wound. His widow cannot be given a pension as a "meritorious" case under the amendment referred to because of section 33. The minister stated distinctly—I wrote down his words—that the case was one for which no provision has been made in the act. Therefore, the Pension board and the appeal board cannot award a pension to the dependents of that man because it is otherwise provided for in the act.

Mr. BELAND: Not in this case.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, in this case.

Mr. BELAND: What was the reason he did not get a pension?

Mr. CLARK: Because he died of a disease not directly connected with his eye—his wound. It was a hundred per cent disability case owing to the fact that this man lost his sight through a wound. I forget what he died of, but we will suppose that it was diphtheria.

Mr. BELAND: Did he die within five years?

Mr. CLARK: He did not.

Mr. BELAND: Then he does not come under the act.

Mr. CLARK: He does come within the act, excuse me.

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. CLARK: Excuse me. I know my point and if it is necessary to explain it again I will. The act provides that if he dies more than five years after dscharge then the disability must be directly attributable to his military service. Now, if he dies of diphtheria it is not attributable to military service is it?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. CLARK: Therefore his dependents will not be paid a pension will they?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. CLARK: Is it a meritorious case?

Mr. BELAND: Certainly.

Mr. CLARK: Assuming it is a meritorious case the minister, I take it, thinks it should be provided for by the act. Is that right?

Mr. BELAND: It is.

Mr. CLARK: Then I say the minister is absolutely wrong and does not understand the principle of the bill, because the amendment he has cited says that the Pension board and the appeal board may award a pension in a meritorious case where that case is not otherwise provided for by the act. Now, the act distinctly provides that if he dies more than five years subsequent to his discharge his dependents cannot receive a pension.

Mr. BELAND: Why?

Mr. CLARK: Unless his death is directly attributable to military service. That is the law, and no provision of this sort can affect it, because it must be a meritorious case which must be provided for by the act. That is clear as daylight, and I am certain that if the minister will take the advice of the Department of Justice there can be no question at all about my argument.

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. BELAND: His case does come within the provisions of the act since he died more than five years after his discharge. If he died within five years the act would apply.

Mr. CLARK: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: There is no provision for him is there?

Mr. CLARK: There is provision in this way: It is expressly provided by the act that if he dies after a period of five years his dependents cannot be awarded a pension unless the disability is directly attributable to military service.

Mr. BELAND: There is no provision in the act under which he can be awarded a pension?

Mr. CLARK: No.

Mr. BELAND: Then he must come under the "meritorious" clause.

Mr. CLARK: I say there is no clause in the act which would give his dependents a pension, but there is a clause which denies them a pension, and as long as that clause denying the pension is in the act, no such clause as the minister has referred to can right that wrong. Because this section is expressly reserved to cases which are not provided for by the act. This case is provided for, it is provided that this man's dependents shall not get a pension.

Mr. BELAND: I do not see the case in the same light as my hon. friend. If the case is unprovided for in the act this man's dependents have a right to present their claim as a meritorious case to the appeal board. That is the intention of the Senate amendment I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the minister has quite caught the point, and I am not so sure that I can state it to the committee more clearly than the hon. member (Mr. Clark) did. My hon. friend would be quite satisfied if the case in question—a case described purely by way of illustration—could come within the "meritorious" cases clause. All he argues for, as I understand it, is that it should have a right to come within that class, and I presume if the case were meritorious it could be dealt with. But he says the only cases that can come within that class are those composed of another class, and these, not being within the compass of the other class, are denied the right to come within it. He only wants the right to come within that class, as provided in the bill before it was amended.

Mr. BELAND: I see the point very clearly, but I will cite another case. If, for instance, the case referred to by my hon. friend were that of a widow dependent upon this soldier who was in straitened circumstances; though there is a section in the act which says that if he died within five years the widow would receive a pension, and if he died after five years she is not entitled to a pension, still the case may come before this board as a meritorious case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says others can, but he cannot; he is denied the right, for the reason that he does not come within the class. He is specifically denied the right to come within the class of those who may come to the board on a meritorious basis.

Mr. CLARK: She may come before the Board of Pension Commissioners and the appeal board, if no provision has been made in the act for such a case.

Mr. CARROLL: Under the broad principle of the act, there is a class entitled to a pension and a class not entitled to pension. I think the Senate amendments will give all those meritorious cases, to whom the act is directed, the power to come before this board composed of the pension commissioners and the appeal board, not that they are entitled to a pension—they may be debarred from it —but they may come before the board on compassionate and meritorious grounds. Some people are entitled to pension under the act and others are debarred from it. If there is a meritorious case, to which compassion will be extended, I think the amendment if it means anything, will bring the case within the class. I am glad that the apprehensions which some of us felt a day or two ago, when the report came out that the Senate was likely to reject the amendments passed by this House to the Pension Act founded on the report of the royal commission, have disappeared. I have discussed this matter with some gentlemen who are deeply interested in the returned soldiers, members of the Great War Veterans; and while they feel that, perhaps, an injustice has been done in some respects, they think the broad insurance principle of the act and the appeal board generally has been maintained in the amendments proposed by the Senate. I hope that the gentlemen who are placed on these appeal boards will have a broad-minded sympathy towards the returned soldiers. I do not think either the soldiers, or their dependents or friends, are anxious that returned soldiers who are not entitled to pensions should receive them. But many cases have been decided by the Board of Pension Commissioners where justice has not been done, in my opinion, to returned soldiers in the past; and this was the ground on which the Great War Veterans Associations and kindred organizations of this country asked for the royal commission. That commission made its report, and while they did away with the nine appeal boards, representing the nine units under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, I think the broad principle of the act as introduced in this House has been maintained; and all I ask at the present time is this: although the Minister of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment has no real jurisdiction over the Board of Pension Commissioners, I think he should make it known in some way, publicly or privately, that it is the desire of himself and of this House that a broadminded sympathy should be extended to the soldiers in this country, because it is better that one soldier who is not entitled to a pension should receive it than that one soldier concerning whose right there is some doubt should be denied the pension. I have no doubt in the world that if the minister expresses this opinion to the Board of Pension Commissioners, and appoints men of broad sympathies to the appeal boards the problem of pensioning soldiers in this country will have been, I think, properly dealt with.

I feel that a great thanks are due to the royal commission for the efforts they put forth to do justice to the returned men of this country. They showed a broad and keen sympathy in their report for the soldiers, which I think the public are anxious should be shown.

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): I trust the minister will make the section relating to the widow in meritorious cases a little clearer. It would be unfortunate if this act were to pass with a clause that is open to argument. The cause of much of the difficulties in the history of the Pension Act has been the obscurity of the wording and difference of interpretation. I think, therefore, the minister would do well if, by the insertion of two or three words, he could eliminate the possibility of an argument or difference of opinion as to the meaning of this clause. At the same time I believe the section as it stands would enable those in charge to carry out the act satisfactorily. As there is this doubt, now is the opportunity of putting it beyond doubt. I would place the claim on the ground of a compassionate allowance. The act does not say that any special case shall not receive compassionate allowance. This is

substantially and in essence a compassionate allowance. While that is quite true it would be wise to make this matter clear beyond all question.

Mr. L. W. HUMPHREY (Kootenay West): I am sure that I and many other members of the House appreciate the action taken by the minister this morning in postponing the presentation of these bills to the House until this sitting, so as to enable some of us to obtain a little more information. I am sure the minister realizes that at the time these bills were presented this morning some of us did not know the real effect of them. Since then we have had an opportunity of studying them a little more closely and have gained some information. I should like to say just a word as regards concurring with the remarks made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll), and particularly to emphasize the fact that I think each member of this House has been watching the proceedings of the Ralston Commission, the action taken by the other legislative body, and the action of the different departments connected with the Board of Pension Commissioners and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I am sure each member of this House knows the attitude of the minister, and they know it is his intention so far as possible to assist in enforcing and carrying out these amendments to the act. By studying the findings of this commission, we shall find that the charges that were laid by the different representatives and the evidence given before that commission in regard to the administration of the Pension Act in past years were well founded. It was proven, in my opinion, that the act was not administered as it was intended it should be. I was wondering if it were possible for members of this House to give a further expression of opinion in regard to the administration of this act as it affects departments under the control of the minister. We must realize that the success of these changes of the act as amended, depends entirely upon administration, and if it is proved by any investigation that the administration has not been what it was intended to be, better satisfaction will be created, not only amongst returned men, but throughout the country as a whole, if it is possible for this House to take any steps that will assure the country that this act will be administered as it was drawn up and intended to be administered. If possible, I should like to urge that thought upon the minister, in a way not bearing against or reflecting upon him at all, but with a view of furthering and bettering the carrying out of the Pension Act.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise only for one purpose. I wish to say a word as regards the pension commissioners. I do so speaking for myself alone, and not in this regard intending to represent the views of others. It has become somewhat the habit to attribute all disappointments in relation to pensions to the pension commissioners. It may be popular to do so. I know how difficult the position of many is. Whenever anything is declined, it is easier, of course, to blame the commissioners than to take any other course. But really I have a sense of justice, and I know nothing has come to my observation—and I have had many complaints all of which I have traced right through—to impair the confidence I have always felt in the chairman of the commission, or in its other members. The chairman of the commission is a man who, in the early days of the war, gave his services in a very difficult capacity, a capacity that men shrank from. He did so vigorously, with great devotion to duty, and with marked ability, for a period of many months, I think at least two years, or close to that. Entirely without remuneration, he gave his services to the country. Thereupon he went overseas and endured the worst that the war had to offer in the way of peril, privation and suffering. His ability is too well known to need words from me; it is well known to hon. members of all sides of the House; but if his ability is excelled by any other quality, it is by his integrity. I know his sympathy would be wholly with the men; indeed, I have heard from his lips expressions that have left, and will leave their impression upon my mind for many years, expressions that have convinced me once and for all, where his sympathy lies. But such is his integrity that no sympathy in the world would sway him from what he felt was his duty under the law. I am just as confident that John Thompson will administer the law truly, accurately and carefully despite all pressure whatever, as I could be of another man in his position.

If parliament wants the law to be different, and parliament does, the right thing to do is to enact it; to make the duty of the commissioners under the law more a duty of sympathy to the men, to make clear just what parliament intends, and the intent of parliament will be carried out in the law. I say that without any reflection on Colonel Ralston, whom I do not know so well by any

means. It is very easy for a commissioner to review this case and that, and, perhaps, to be of a different opinion. I do not impugn the sincerity of his opinion; but nevertheless, no matter who are the commissioners, no matter what is the law, and no matter how long we have experience in these matters, we shall always be able to say that in respect of this, that or the other case, a lack of sympathy was shown. Such is inevitable and inevitable, not only in a small degree, but in a great degree, and it is going to be the case from this on. It will be the case no matter who in the world sits in those seats. I thought it my duty to say this for Mr. Thompson. I have seen very little of him during the discharge of his duties as Pension Commissioner, but I know him well enough to say that he has been actuated by nothing but a desire to carry out the law as he comprehends the law.

Right Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to be permitted to add a word. Busily engaged as I have been in other things, I have not had an opportunity to pay as much attention to this very important question of pensions for soldiers as I desire, and I do not wish to discuss anything that has happened as between the pension commissioners and others. But I ask permission to say a word or two from my personal experience, not so much as a minister, as a member of parliament. Many of my constituents had, as they thought, claims against the Pension board, and like other members, I received complaints. In every instance when I went to the Pension board I am satisfied I received from Colonel Thompson and his associates absolute justice. I say that in strict justice to them. I have the highest respect for Colonel Thompson, and while he may have erred in some of these matters, from my personal knowledge of him, representing as I did a number of people in my constituency who had complaints which they desired to have considered, I can say that he brought to the performance of his duty a high sense of responsibility that bore testimony to his eminent qualification for the position he fills.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): I feel that I am bound to say something on this question, because I represent a constituency in which there are between 25,000 and 35,000 pensioners. Now I realize that the Senate is a very useful body and performs a serviceable function in this country. But in this instance I think that Chamber has not acted in the best interests of the people of Canada. The legislation was passed by the House of Commons after the most mature consideration. Last session a special committee went thoroughly into the whole question, holding some 47 meetings during the three or four months that it functioned. It utilized the material that had been established by its predecessors and heard various witnesses from all parts of the country. Before that committee evidence was given by the Pension board and by pensioners from every part of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The findings of the committee were crystallized into legislation, and after their work had been concluded a royal commission was appointed to investigate the entire subject relating to the pensions of returned soldiers. That commission visited many cities and took copious evidence, and the legislation that has now been passed by this House has been based on the soundest and the most complete inquiry that has ever been held into any subject of so important a character. The legislation was not hastily drafted; it was not ill-advised, nor ill-considered. The minister himself devoted a large part of his holiday to a study of the situation and he was assisted very efficiently by his deputy. They went exhaustively into the whole question, gathering material from every conceivable source, so that their investigation might be of practical assistance in the preparation of the legislation that was subsequently submitted to the House of Commons and adopted thereby. When brought down in this House the bill was considered very carefully clause by clause and the committee in a laudable manner forgot party for the time being, bearing in mind only the good of the soldiers themselves. The bill finally received its third reading and was sent to the Senate. I repeat, the Senate performs certain useful duties; and hon. members of that body, like hon. gentlemen in this Chamber, have the proud distinction of having had sons who participated in the war. But I do not think that the Senate was well-advised in dealing with the bill as it has done.

We are spending millions of dollars in this country on railways, on breakwaters, on canals and on other public works of various descriptions, and when we can devote such expenditures to the material necessities of the country, I think it should be the first duty of every member of parliament, whether of the House of Commons or the Senate, to see that the country's supreme duty by the soldiers is adequately discharged. These men went to the front and suffered for $1.10 a day, and 7,000 of those that went from my city will never

come back. In the position of Mayor of Toronto, which I had the honour to hold for seven years, there came to my attention, during a great part of that time, between fifty and sixty cases of returned men every day. The matter took up a great deal of my time, which, let me say, I never grudged for a moment. But my experience served to inform me of the great need of these men. I am therefore exceedingly sorry that the Senate should have interfered with a matter of this kind which comes altogether within the purview of this House, composed, as it is, of members who represent directly the people of the country. The Senate, I think, would have been well-advised to have left the question entirely to this Chamber. I hope, therefore, that the minister will maintain his position in this matter. If this bill were carried as originally passed by this House I am sure it would work satisfactorily in the interests of the returned soldiers.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): The representatives of Labour in this country are not satisfied with this bill as amended by the Senate. I am sure that the House of Commons has very well expressed its opinion concerning the obligations which Canada owes to all her returned men who have suffered in any way in the discharge of their duties in the late war. Those obligations, we are all agreed, should be made good; that was the opinion of this House as embodied in the bill that went to the Senate and which now comes back more or less mutilated. It is deplorable that a body that is not responsible to the country should have the power to frustrate the wishes of the people's representatives in this way. Notwithstanding the expressions of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) with regard to the Pension board, I have an idea that they did more than their duty. I do not take issue with the right hon. gentleman as to the ability of the members of the board, but I do think that the representatives of the returned soldiers had some grievance inasmuch as it appears that the Pension board exceeded their duty. I think we should carry out our obligations to the returned men; of this there can be no question. It is the opinion of parliament, and there is plenty of money for the purpose. The Senate need not be concerned about saving the people's money in the way they evidently propose. The cry of economy so far as it affects the returned soldiers is false, for these men have well earned much more than we can give them. I very much regret that the act was mangled in the way it has been, and I hope that next session it will be again introduced and at that time carried into effect.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): It seems to me that Canada has assumed two distinct classes of obligations as a result of her participation in the world war: One, the financial obligations to those who loaned money to the country at that time; and the other, a moral obligation to the men who went overseas and fought in the service of their country and who have come back suffering disabilities which have incapacited them for their duties in civil life. It would be just as logical for the Minister of Finance to inform the bondholders that their interest rates were now reduced to three per cent as it is to inform these men that we must practise economy at their expense, and thus fail to discharge a moral obligation by which the country is bound to them. I must admit I have not given the matter a great deal of study, but from my rather superficial view of it I am inclined to think that after all it is not legislation that is needed. This House gave its opinion in no uncertain way that it desired the Pension board to interpret the law in the most generous manner possible, and I believe that even though the Senate may have seen fit to reject the legislation precisely as passed by this House, an expression of opinion from the House of Commons itself should be almost sufficient to impart to the board the spirit in which it is desired the law should be carried out.

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

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Consideration of amendment by the Senate to Bill No. 204 to amend the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, the only amendment is intended to fit in with the new federal appeal board. There can be no objection to the amendment, and therefore I move that it be concurred in.

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

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Further consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 203 respecting the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, though these amendments to a certain degree restrict the privileges contained in the original act, I think they should be concurred in. As explained this morning, these amendments provide that all returned soldiers who previous to July 1, 1922 applied for insurance, and were refused, shall, without medical examination, be given the benefits of the Insurance Act if they have actual dependents. There are only seventy-one cases involved, and I hope the majority of them have dependents. Therefore I move concurrence in the amendments.

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

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

HALIFAX TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Mr. MacKELVIE:

1 When was the public elevator at the Halifax terminals first erected, by what bodies was the money supplied for the purpose and in what amounts?

2. What was the capacity of such elevator?

3. How much grain was put through it in each of the years of its existence?

4. For what period, if any, was its capacity used?

5. Have representations been made to the government by the Canadian National Railways to supply capital requirements for a new elevator at Halifax? If so, when, and what is the government's policy with regard thereto?

6. Have representations been made to the government by the Canadian National Railways to supply capital requirements for the construction of a railway pier terminal at Dartmouth? If so, what is the policy of the government with regard thereto?

7. Have representations been made to the government by the Canadian National Railways to supply capital requirements to construct a terminal pier at Sydney? If so, what is the policy of the government with regard thereto.

8. Is it intended that the Canadian National Railways shall grant the Canadian Pacific Railway running rights over the Atlantic division of the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Elevator was built in the year 1898 as a capitial expenditure of the Government Railways at a cost of $110,622.

2. 500,000 bushels.

3.

Year	Bushels
1903	71,826
1904	75,611
1905	139,739
1906	30,283
1907	Nil
1908	17,925
1909	350,318
1910	222,822
1911	198,685
1912	Nil
1913	959,390
1914	1,518,092
1915	639,666
1916	975,242
1917	1,850,400
1918	4,700,097
1919	3,825,000
1920	901,211
1921	149,790
1922	10,468
1922	10,077

4. On several occasions elevator has been filled to capacity. It will be seen from answer to question 3 that the largest quantity of grain handled was in 1918. The superintendent advises that elevator could have handled double the quantity if worked to full capacity between the months of November and May.

5. Provision has been made by the government in supplementary estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce to build a new elevator at Halifax which will be operated by Canadian National Railways.

6. No.

7. No.

8. No application has been received by the Canadian National Railways to grant such running rights to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

HALIFAX TERMINAL FACILITIES

Mr. MacLAREN:

1. What is the policy of the government with respect to capital requirements to complete the landing sheds and passenger station at the Halifax ocean terminals?

2. Have any arrangements been made for steamship sailings of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine between Canadian and American ports, and British and European ports for the season of 1924?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The policy of the government in such matters will depend upon the recommendation of the chairman and board of directors, Canadian National Railways, and the financial conditions of the country

2. No arrangements have as yet been made for sailing of Canadian Government Merchant Marine steamers between Canadian and American ports and British and European ports for season 1924.

IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT—QUEBEC

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. What is the number of permanent employees or officials, at present, in the Department of Immigration at Quebec and how many of them speak French fluently?

2. How many residents of Quebec have obtained positions in the Department of Immigration, at Quebec?

3. How many outsiders have been transferred to the Department of Immigration, at Quebec?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

(1) 34; 18 speak French fluently.

(2) 27 of permanent employees mentioned in number 1 are residents of Quebec; 23 other residents of Quebec have been appointed for the navigation season.

(3) Eight, temporarily.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—COAL PURCHASES

Mr. HANSON:

1. What was the value of the coal purchased from the United States by the Canadian National Railways, including all routes or systems embraced in its operation, in the following fiscal years: 1920-1921, 1921-1922, and 1922-1923?

2. How was the amount distributed among the various units of the Canadian National System?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Announcement respecting coal purchased by Canadian National Railways during preceding year is made by Minister of Railways in his annual statement to Parliament. This information gives total quantities, average price and source of supply. The attached statement gives this information for the years 1920-21-22, as regards the Canadian National Railways distinct from the Grand Trunk, and for the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the years 1921 and 1922. The Grand Trunk was privately-owned and operated in 1920.

2. The Railway Management has been asked to supply a statement as to the distribution of these coal purchases among the various units of the Canadian National System. As this information goes back three years, and covers each of the several groups, it will take some time to secure the information.

Canadian National Railways
Coal Purchases
1920

	Tons
Canadian Coal	2,145,513
Average price, $5.40 net ton.	
Total cost, $11,606,041.82.	
United States Coal	1,509,917
Average price, $9.67 net ton.	
Total cost, $14,605,212.52.	
British Coal	Nil

1921

Canadian Coal	2,505,389
Average price, $5.71 net ton.	
Total cost, $14,320,504.53.	
United States Coal	977,096
Average price, $6.47 net ton.	
Total cost, $6,324,450.94.	
British Coal	Nil

1922

Canadian Coal	2,198,039
Average price, $4.83 net ton.	
Total cost, $10,621,037.57.	
United States Coal	798,330
Average price, $7.13 net ton.	
Total cost, $5,693,783.90.	
Great Britain Coal	57,460
Average price, $6.90 net ton.	
Total cost, $396,533.75.	

Grand Trunk Railway System
Coal Purchases

1921

	Tons
Canadian Coal	150,080
Average price, $7.38.	
Total cost, $1,107,591.	
United States Coal	2,733,584
Average price, $5.56.	
Total cost, $15,207,161.	
British Coal	Nil

1922

Canadian Coal	348,696
Average price, $5.81.	
United States Coal	2,157,134
Average price, $6.56.	
British Coal	59,893
Average price, $8,59.	

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—ALBERTA COAL

Mr. SHAW:

1. What persons, firms and corporations in the province of Alberta supply coal to the Canadian National Railways?

2. What price is paid per ton?

3. Are the contracts for such coal awarded by tender?

4. For what period have such contracts, if any, been awarded?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Brazeau Collieries, Big Valley Collieries, Blackstone Coal Company, Blue Diamond Coal Compaay, Bush Mine Coal Company, Coal Valley Mining Company, Ellis Coal Company, Lakeside Coals, Coal Sellers Limited, Spicer Coal Company, Tofield Coal Company, Marcus Collieries, Mountain Park Coal Company, Rosedale Coal Company,

Cadomin Coal Company, Humberstone Coal Company, Mount Cavell, Superior Collieries, Sterling Collieries.

2. The management does not consider it in the interests of the Canadian National Railways to publish this information.

3. Yes.

4. Such contracts run from April 1, to March 31, each year.

PUGSLEY COMMISSION—REPARATION CLAIMS

Mr. HARRIS:

1. Has the government authorized Hon. W. Pugsley to investigate claims for reparations for atrocities committed during Great War?

2. Are the claims for reparation for atrocities being disposed of before the claims for property damage?

3. Are the claims for reparation for atrocities already filed being reviewed by Pugsley Commission?

4. Is Pugsley Commission calling claimants to give evidence in said cases?

5. Are claimants being advised of the time and place of sittings?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The government has appointed the Honourable William Pugsley, K.C., LLD., to investigate and report upon all claims that have been submitted for reparation, and to ascertain whether or not they come within the meaning of the following subsections of Annex I to Article 232 of the Treaty of Versailles:

Annex I

(1) Damage to injured persons and to surviving dependents by personal injury to or death of civilians caused by acts of war including bombardments or other attacks on land, on sea, or from the air, and all the direct consequence thereof, and of all operations of war by the two groups of belligerents wherever arising.

(2) Damage caused by Germany or her allies to civilian victims of acts of cruelty, violence or maltreatment (including injuries to life or health as a consequence of imprisonment, deportation, internment or evacuation, of exposure at sea or of being forced to labour) wherever arising, and to the surviving dependents of such victims.

(3) Damage caused by Germany or her allies in their own territory or in occupied or invaded territory to civilian victims of all acts injurious to health or capacity to work, or to honour, as well as to the surviving dependents of such victims.

(4) Damage caused by any kind of maltreatment of prisoners of war.

(8) Damage caused to civilians by being forced by Germany or her allies to labour without just remuneration.

(9) Damage in respect of all property wherever situated belonging to any of the Allied or Associated States or their nationals, with the exception of naval and military works or materials, which has been carried off, seized, injured or destroyed by the acts of Germany or her allies on land, on sea or from the air, or damage directly in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war.

(10) Damage in the form of levies, fines and other similar exactions imposed by Germany or her allies upon the civilian population.

2. No. All claims are being heard on an equal footing.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. All claimants are permitted to give evidence upon oath in support of their claims.

5. Registered notices advising the claimants of the time and place of sittings are sent to each applicant who has filed a claim in this office, and furthermore notices are published in the press prior to the commencement of the sittings.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House returned to Orders of the Day.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—BRANCH LINES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, a report appears in the papers this morning in regard to the disposition of the Canadian National Railways Bill by the Senate, to which I wish to call the attention of the government, although I hardly think it is necessary. This report will come as a death knell to the hopes of thousands of people in the West. It will reach the outlying districts to-morrow or the next day, some it may not reach for a week, but it will bring keen disappointment to all those who for many years have been promised railway facilities.

In view of the situation, more particularly in the prairie provinces, I would ask the government if there is no possible way of overcoming the present unsatisfactory disposition of the bill? The people in the West who would have been served by the construction of the branch lines proposed in the legislation which went through this House have had their hopes deferred for many years, and now when there appeared to be every prospect of their at last obtaining relief we see their expectations suddenly dashed to the ground. Is there no possibility of bringing in a supplementary estimate or in some other way meeting the situation so that some of these branch lines may be proceeded with?

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the government introduced the bill to which my hon. friend has just made reference it was proceeding in accordance with the wishes of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways. The board in this matter acted in a manner similar to that in which the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have acted. In other words, these large companies in planning their work seek to have it so arranged that it may be distributed over a period of years. Sometimes it is not convenient to go on with work in one locality or at one particular time, while it may be convenient to go on with other work, depending largely on circumstances, sometimes even upon climatic conditions and the like. For that reason we felt when the Board of Directors of the National Railways presented its programme that it was the government's obligation to present the programme to the House in the form in which it had been received and recommended. This was done, and I think the Minister of Railways made quite clear to the House at the time why the matter was presented in that form. Now the measure has finally been defeated in the other House. It is not for any of us in this House to comment upon the reasons, but so far as one is able to gather from reading the debates it would appear that the objection has been primarily that of additional expenditures on the National Railways. I cannot see, if that is the reason, how the bringing in of an estimate to cover the amount for this year would help to meet the situation. However, apart from that, the preparation of estimates involving expenditures of that kind is not quickly or easily made. The government would have to take into consideration not the estimate for this year only but the amount that was suggested in relation to its distribution over three years. I should feel that having accepted the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the railway, it would be advisable for the Minister of Railways to have the opportunity of conferring with the board before he attempted to do anything in the way of meeting the situation that has arisen.

As hon. members have heard, His Excellency has sent word that he hopes to prorogue the House this afternoon at three o'clock. We have all been doing our utmost to arrange for prorogation to-day, and I think it would be impossible for the government to prepare and submit to parliament further Supplementary Estimates at this time. Hon. members, moreover, will recall that notwithstanding the Estimates were presented on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week the government was very severely taken to account yesterday on account of the lateness at which these particular Estimates were brought down.

I think the circumstances regrettable. I am inclined to feel that my hon. friend has perhaps used words not too strong to express the seriousness of the action which has been taken by the other Chamber. So far as the government during the recess can find any way in conference with the Board of Directors so far as the Board of Directors can work out any way, if they can, towards helping to meet the situation, the government of course will co-operate with them to that extent, but beyond that I imagine that matters will have to stand over until the House meets again at a subsequent session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that this is practically all the business that the House has before it, with the exception of a bill that is before the Senate, and which I understand the Senate is amending. It is the bill respecting the Canadian National Railway Act, 1919: I have just been informed that the Senate suggests an adjournment of this House until half-past two. The Senate is taking a similar adjournment to have a conference with the hon. Minister of Finance in the interval. If it is agreeable it might be understood that the House will adjourn to reassemble at 2.30.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.): Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, might I ask if the government would consider sitting on Tuesday next to take up resolution No. 58 standing in the name of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis), under the head of Public Bills and Orders.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend can secure the unanimous consent of the House, the government will be pleased to do so.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at 2.30 o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENT

Right Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 244, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act, 1919.

He said: The amendment to this bill reads as follows:

Nothing herein contained shall be construed as granting power to guarantee any securities, the issue of which has not been authorized by parliament.

Motion agreed to. Amendment read the second time and concurred in.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker: His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

In the Senate Chamber, His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

BILLS ASSENTED TO

An Act to incorporate Family Trust.
An Act to amend The Immigration Act.
An Act for the relief of Lillian Beryl Brayman.
An Act for the relief of Roland Bergeron.
An Act for the relief of Florence Cohn.
An Act for the relief of William August Kruger.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Benjamin Brown.
An Act for the relief of Elva Burnside.
An Act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Candy.
An Act for the relief of Cecilia Maria Taylor.
An Act respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.
An Act to amend The Judges Act.
An Act to amend The Public Service Retirement Act.
An Act to amend The Naturalization Acts, 1914 and 1920.
An Act to amend The Militia Pension Act.
An Act to amend The Bankruptcy Act.
An Act respecting The Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.
An Act for the relief of Abraham Brooks.
An Act for the relief of Clara Wellena Bristol.
An Act for the relief of Emma Jean Walker.
An Act for the relief of Ella Maude Gee.
An Act for the relief of Enid Louise MacDonald.
An Act for the relief of Mary Theresa MacIsaac.
An Act for the relief of Jane Edna Near.
An Act respecting the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners.
An Act to amend The Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910.
An Act to amend The Canada Shipping Act.
An Act to amend the Yukon Act.
An Act for the relief of John Samuel McDonnell.
An Act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Conkey.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Marie Pope.
An Act for the relief of Loretta May Girard.
An Act for the relief of Birdena Frances Wallace LeMay.
An Act for the relief of Jessie Anne Epstein.
An Act for the relief of Herbert Hugh Keller.
An Act for the relief of Nellie May DeBlaquire.
An Act with respect to Freight Rates for the Carriage of Grain by Lake and River Navigation.
An Act to amend The Canada Shipping Act.
An Act to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act.
An Act to amend The Insurance Act, 1917.
An Act to repeal the Acts respecting Bounties on manufactures from Manila Fibre in Canada.
An Act to amend The Dominion Lands Act.
An Act respecting Banks and Banking.
An Act to amend The Biological Board Act.
An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.
An Act respecting the payment of Bounties on Petroleum.
An Act respecting the payment of Bounties on certain manufactures of Hemp.
An Act to amend The Customs Tariff, 1907.
An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.
An Act to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915.
An Act to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act, 1913.
An Act to amend the Export Act.
An Act to supplement The Finance Act, 1914
An Act respecting the payment of Bounties on Conper Bars or Rods.
An Act respecting Chinese Immigration
An Act to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.
An Act to provide for further advances to The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.
An Act to amend The Income War Tax Act, 1917.
An Act for the Protection of the Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery.
An Act to amend The Feeding Stuffs Act.
An Act to amend the Dairy Industry Act.
An Act for the relief of Flossie May Pinkham.
An Act to amend The Criminal Code.
An Act to amend the Companies Act.
An Act to constitute a Board of Audit.
An Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.
An Act in respect of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.
An Act to amend The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act.
An Act to amend the Pensions Act.
An Act to amend the Canadian National Railways Act, 1919.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Excellency:

The Commons of Canada have voted Supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1923 and 31st March, 1924.

To which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these Bills.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Second Session of the Fourteenth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

In bringing to a conclusion the work of the present session of parliament, I desire to express my gratification at the many useful and important measures which have been enacted.

The passing of the Bills respecting Treaties with France and Italy completes Canada's part in the desired commercial arrangements. Early completion on the part of the Governments of France and Italy and the exchange of ratifications necessary to give effect to the Treaties are confidently expected. It is anticipated that the operation of these Conventions will promote our trade and increase our good relations with these two nations, which were among our great allies in the late war.

The decennial revision of the Bank Act deservedly received careful attention at your hands. It is confidently hoped that the amendments made, in the light of experience, will, so far as legislation can, provide the safeguards required to ensure the efficiency of the banking system.

The changes made in the customs and excise laws will, it is believed, make for a simplification which is desirable and at the same time strengthen the financial position of the Dominion.

Pursuant to the recommendations of the Royal Commission appointed by the government prior to the opening of the session, legislation has been enacted with respect to lake and river transportation which, it is hoped, will prevent the control of freight rates and insurance upon grain shipments such as has hitherto existed.

The whole subject of the handling and marketing of grain in Canada and other matters incidental to the buying, selling and transportation of grain is being further investigated.

The Act to provide for the investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers will afford the public a much needed safeguard against possible undue enhancement of prices or unfair restrictions of trade.

Several legislative enactments in pursuance of the report of the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-establishment have shown your desire to take every possible means of fulfilling just obligations towards the ex-service men, and their dependents.

An increasing immigration has been a significant feature of the present year. Agreements have been negotiated with the British Government for co-operation in an Assisted Passage Scheme; and closer co-operation has been effected between the Railways, Shipping Companies and the Department of Immigration and Colonization which, it is anticipated, will produce a large increase in the number of desirable settlers.

It is gratifying to note that the position of the Government railways has steadily improved, as the co-ordination of the national lines and facilities has become increasingly effective.

The important agricultural enactments of the session should prove of substantial service in the development of the fruit, live stock, grain and dairying industries of the country.

The revisions and amendments of the Acts respecting Patents of Invention, Trade Marks and Designs, Copyright, and Naturalization render these measures more effective and give to their provisions a wider international significance.

The approval given the treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America providing effective measures for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the Northern Pacific Ocean, and the legislation incidental thereto, make possible the conservation of this great natural resource to the mutual benefit of our country and of our neighbour to the south.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for the public service.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The many evidences of a returning prosperity which, with the passing of the months, have become increasingly apparent, are now supplemented by the promise of a bountiful harvest. For these and other blessings I join with you in humble thanksgiving to Divine Providence.

This concluded the Second Session of the Fourteenth Parliament.

OTTAWA: Printed by F. A. ACLAND, printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1923.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1923

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=First, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Live Stock Acts Amdt.

Abbott's Harbour, N.S., breakwater, 4563

Abitibi Region
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Transcontinental railway, 2833

Abolition of Capital Punishment. *See* Capital Punishment

Abolition of Grand Jury system. *See* Grand Jury

Academy of Arts. *See* Royal Academy of Arts

Accidents
Automobile, 3958
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Industrial and other, 3957
Insurance, 3978

Accounts. See Board of Audit Act; Finance

Accredited Herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Acland, Mr. F. A. *See* King's Printer; Printing Bureau

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* National Defence.

Actuarial Computations. *See* Labour, Annuities

Adams, Dr. Frank, the coal situation, 1265

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 9, 34, 54, 75, 99, 122
Mover (Mr. Putnam) 9
Seconder (Mr. Rheaume) 16
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) 65; neg. 178
Amdt. to (Mr. Shaw) 72; neg. 177
Motion agreed to, 179

Address—*Con.*
Speakers, Messrs: Bancroft, 99; Baxter, 132; Black (Yukon) 85; Brown, 47; Carroll, 80; Drayton, 153; Duff, 108; Evans, 145; Fielding, 89; Forke, 34; Graham, 54; Hoey, 63; amdt. 65; Hughes, 123; Kellner, 106; King, Mackenzie, 27; Lewis, 117; Lucas, 75; McConica, 166; McMaster, 172; Martell, 101; Meighen, 17; Millar, 50; Neill, 174; Raymond, 160; Robinson, 72; Shaw, 66; amdt. to amdt., 72; Stewart (Leeds), 169; Stork, 149; Woodsworth, 41

Acknowledgment of by Governor General, 1256

Legislation referred to in, qu. 2612

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration. *See* Government

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Act Amdt. Bill (Deputy Local Judges and Deputy Registrars) Res., 1080, 2051; 1r., 2r., com., 2052; com., 3r., 2204

Adulteration of Grain. *See* Grain

Adulteration of Mill Feeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Advertising. *See* Immigration; Labour; Magazines and Periodicals; Press; Publicity

Advisory Council. *See* Research

Advisory Fuel Committee. *See* Fuel Supply.

Advisory Tariff Commission. *See* Tariff

Advocate, N.S., wharf, 4560

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air.

Aeroplanes. *See* Air; National Defence, Canadian Air Force

After War Conditions, 1231. *See also* War

Agassiz experimental farm. *See* Agriculture

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agricultural Conditions. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Implements. *See also* speeches on Budget; Reciprocity with United States; Treaties, French Treaty
- Comparative prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
- Duties, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
  - *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff
  - Complaint of, 2863
  - Increased by increased price, 2848, 2975
  - Reduction of, 2743
- Free admission to United States, 3017, 3062, 3499
- French Treaty, 2001, 2246
- Georgia pine, importation for, 3411
- Imports, qu. 617
- Live stock, required to purchase, 1408
- Manufacturing of, 2247
- Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., speech in 1911, 2848, 2974
- Prices, 2836, 2991, 3070. *See also that title*
  - Comparison with United States, 2739
- Standardization, 789, 805
- Stumping machines, duty, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
- Taxation of, 1850
- Wheat, bushels required to purchase, 1912 and 1922, 1408

Agricultural Institute. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Instruction Act. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Farmers; Immigration; Labour

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration
- Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals
- Agricultural conditions, 641, 1165, 1189, 1190, 1192, 1196, 1201, 1231, 1357, 1398, 1402, 1407, 1423, 1438, 1841-47, 1880, 2797, 2810, 2815, 2829, 2830, 2861, 2872, 2928, 2961, 3002, 4038. *See also* Western Provinces
  - Aird, Sir John, 1407
  - "Calamity howlers", 2928, 2977

Agriculture—*Con.*
- Agricultural Conditions—*Con.*
  - Canada generally, 2763
  - Farmers' profits, 2873
  - Financing. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits
  - Great Britain in. *See that title*
  - Interest rates 2962
  - Larcombe, Mr. Samuel, statement, 2873
  - Parliament difficult to convince, 2730
  - Past and present price comparison, 2978
  - Pioneering, 2870
  - Prince Edward Island, 2972
  - Production costs and prices, 2835
  - Special Committee
    - Appointed, 706
    - Bradshaw Mr. Thomas, statement, 2829
    - Evidence, 2972
    - Inquiry as to, 667
    - Leave to report, 911
    - Leitch Prof., dairying industry, 1843, 1845, 1851, 1858
    - Oleomargarine, 3271
    - Railway and shipping combine, 1395
    - Reports qu. 2612
      - First, 911
      - Second, 986
      - Third, 1136
        - M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 1209
      - Fourth, 2127. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
        - Interim, printing, 2181
      - Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh
        - M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 4295, 4363
      - Fifth, 4007
      - Sixth and Seventh 4075
    - Tariff Commmission evidence, 2296
    - United States. *See that title*
    - Western provinces 1885, 2845. *See also that title*
- Agricultural Credits. *See* Credits
- Agricultural education 2869
- Agricultural exports, 1904. *See also* Imports and Exports
- Agricultural fairs. *See also* Exhibitions
  - Horse-racing, 726, 750
- Agricultural Instruction Act, 3315. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
  - Grant 607
  - Renewal of, qu. 490
- Agricultural lands, 1344. *See also* Immigration; Lands
- Agricultural loans. *See* Credits
- Agricultural products 1857, 2716
  - Beans, 2981
  - Distribution, 1852, 2868

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Products—*Con.*
Duties on, qu. 1992
Comparison with United States, 2958
Reduction by order in council 2650
United States tariff against 2649, 2650
Exports, 1390, 1838, 3061. *See also* Imports and Exports
Freight rates, 3195. *See also that title*
French treaty, 1978, 2006, 2247. *See also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports, 445, qu. 617, 2708, 2917, 2958, *See also* Imports and Exports; United States
United States from, 1249
Markets, 1410, 1414, 2869, 3066, 4027. *See also* Markets; Treaties, French Treaty
Competitive, 1804
Disorganized, 2861
France, 2235
Great Britain, 1905, 2714
Marketing agent in, 4675
Home market fallacy, 2849
Marketing and quality, live stock, 2862 *See also* Live Stock.
Prices, 1168, 2731, 2748, 2861, 2928, 3018, 3069. *See also* Prices
Europe in, 1052
Manufactured products and, 1083, 1407, 1851, 1885, 1907
Production cost, 1858
United States, 2810, 2910. *See also that title*
Agricultural representative in Great Britain, 3291
Agriculture and Colonization Committee
Changes in personnel, 2926, 3261
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3266
Reports
First, 666, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Assistance to, 2947, 3237. *See also* Bounties
Bacon production. *See* Bacon
Bacteriology, 462
Bad farming, 1887, 2809, 2810, 2812
Banking system and, 4014. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill; Banks and Banking; Credits; speeches on Budget
Bee-keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Biological laboratories, 580
Bonus, 3239
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Agriculture—*Con.*
British Columbia, increased production, 1432
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Canadian Council of. *See that title*
Cereals, milling and baking test, 463
Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
Combines and, 2786, 2787. *See also* Combines
Commissioner. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See under this title,* Agriculture and Colonization
Conditions. *See under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Co-operation, 1400, 1852, 2869. *See also* Co-operation; Markets
Dairying Industry. *See that title*
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Department
Commissioner of. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Cook, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
Deputy Minister, 2065
Salary, 611, 4669
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Dryden, Mr. W. A., qu. 384
Trip to South America, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705
Employees, 815
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3303, 3988, 4074
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See that title.*
Officials attending fairs, 285
Salaries and contingencies 610, 3303
Seed branch, 4621
Staff, 2756
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179
Depression in, 1083, 1889. *See also* Immigration, and *under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Destructive Insect and Pest Act
Administration, 595, 3988. *See also,* Insect Pests
Diseases of Animals. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Economic organization, 1857, 1858, 1863
Eggs. *See that title*
Entomological branch 3988
Forest destruction by insects, qu. 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Experimental and illustration farms, 456, 3237
Agassiz, 457
Botany, division, forest destruction, 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Brandon, 457, 459
British Columbia, 458

Agriculture—*Con.*
Experimental Farms—*Con.*
Buildings, 4629
Cap Rouge, 459
Central, Ottawa, 456, 465, 485, 2869
Buildings, 4631
Charlottetown, 460, 470
Fredericton, 460, 471
Grain, new varieties, 483
Harrow, 466
Indian Head, 459, 472
Irrigation, Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
Kapuskasing, 459
Kentville, 460
Lacombe, 458, 471
La Ferme, Quebec, 471
Lennoxville, 460
Lethbridge, 458
Livestock, 460-485. *See also that title*
Nappan, 457, 460
Dairy herd, experiment with, 2863
Morden, 459
M. (Mr. Leader) to reduce appropriation, neg. 486
Overlapping, 4633
Publicity, 463, 470
Rosthern, 460
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, 460, qu. 1028
Scott, 458
Summerland, 464
Swift Current, 458
Farm credits, 1088, 2869, *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm homes, 1215. *See also* Housing
Farm labour, 1166 ,1174, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Immigration; Labour
Competition with protected industries, 2731
Demand for, 1168
Immigration of, 1100
Farm loans and mortgages, 170-1, 2763, 2962, 4041. *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm products. *See under this title* Agricultural Products
Farm women, 1844
Farmers. *See also that title*
City man and, 2869
Earnings, 2813, 3023
In parliament, 2787. *See also* Progressive party
National policy, 2917
Feeding Stuffs, adulteration. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Fertilizers. *See that title*
Field crops, 1889, 2861
Competitions, 600, 602
Production of, 2846
Value, 2845, 2934

Agriculture—*Con.*
Forage plants, 463
Free land available for settlement, 1087
French treaty, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Fruit. *See that title*
Grain-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grants to provinces, qu. 490
Grasshoppers, 2774. *See also under this title,* Destructive Insects; Insect pests
Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock
Hudson Bay region, possibilities of, 1065
Immigration and, 1186, 1228. *See also* Immigration
Income tax. *See also* Taxation
Agricultural forms, 4498
Payments by farmers, qu. 1259
Insect pests and fungus diseases, 2774. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Insect Pests
Interest rates in western Canada, 1088. *See also* Bank Act; Budget speeches; Credits
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Land. *See also* Dominion Lands; Lands
Along national railways, price, 1087
Sale of in western provinces. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Live stock. *See that title*
Maritime provinces, conditions in, 1132
Markets. *See under this title* Agricultural Products; *also* Markets
Methods, 3071
Mixed farming, 2747, 2772, 2862, 2953
National policy and, 2786
Needs of, 3065
Noble Foundation farm, 2813
Noxious weeds, 1887, 1888, 2305. *See also* Seed
Organizations, 2976
Plant pathology, 463
"Plutocrats and profiteers," burden of, 1417-18
Poor farming, allegation of. *See under this title* Bad farming
Potatoes. *See* Vegetables
Production, cost of, 640, 1190, 1410
Profitable lines of, 2862
Publications. *See* Government Publications
Review of. *See under this title* Experimental Farms
Sacrifices, 3065
Seed. *See that title*
Seed testing. *See* Seed
Single-crop farming, 2862
Specialized, 2763
Stability, 3068

Agriculture—*Con.*
Tariff and, 1355. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Two ministers of, 3313
Votes for, 3237
Wages of farm labourers. *See* Labour
Weed menace, 1887, 1888, 2305
Wheat-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Air Board, annual report, 4510

Air Force. *See* National Defence

Air Service. *See also* Canadian Air Force, under National Defence
Destructive insects and pests, control of, 597
Forest patrol. *See* Forests and Forestry

Aird, Sir John
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Prices, agricultural implements and farm products, 1409

Alaskan, steamship, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330

Alberta. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 1435, 1438, 2766. *See also* Agriculture; Freight Rates; Immigration
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045, 4048
Bituminous sands, 3198
Butter shipments to China, 1840
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal, 790, 1262, 1265, 1275, 1281, 1282, 4692. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Consumption in Ontario, 1276
Freight rates on, 1280, 2781, 2828
Mines, 3424
Crown lands, revenue from, qu. 2515
Dairying industry, 1839, 1851, 2766
Production 1921, 2774
Destitution, 1440
Dominion forest reserves, 1256, 2061
Dredging, 1012
Farms, abandoned, 67
Freight rates, 1957, 1958. *See also that title*
Grain production, 1435
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Hemp production, 2780. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Highways. *See* Canada Highways bill;
Immigration, 1476. *See also that title*
Indians, 2145
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Iron ore, 2512
Irrigation, 1436, 3428
Liberal Convention, 2995

Alberta—*Con.*
Mixed farming, 2772
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Oil, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling, 2508
Prospecting and developing, 780
Political patronage, 522
Privy Council decision, 2559
Public buildings, 1023
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1155
Settlers' relief, 3447
Tax sales, 4062
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tourist traffic, 3438
United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 1440
Vermilion, town lots, qu. 489, 1307, 2417

Alcohol, denatured. *See* Inland Revenue

Alderson Claim. *See* Live Stock

Alfred peat plant. *See* Fuel Supply.

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Naturalization Act Amdt.
Convicted, deportation of, 2123
Enemies.
Citizenship, 1380
Immigration, restriction of, 1128. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Property, 2499. *See also* War Claims
Claim of Canada against United States, 2496, 3823
Custodian of, qu. 1486
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointed as Commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Securities held by United States custodian, 2496

Alliances, Political. *See also* speeches on Budget; Political Parties
Liberals and Conservatives on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245

Alpine Club grant, 3414, 3444, 3954

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminium Company of America, Massena plant, 659

Ambassador, British, at Washington. *See* British Ambassador; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Ambassador to United States. *See* Canadian Representation

Amendments. *See* House of Commons

American Bank Note Company, postage stamps, printing, 1818

Americanization. *See* Magazines and Periodicals

Amery, Colonel L. C., 1328
Economic conditions in Great Britain, 1205
West Indies steamship service, 3392

Ammunition. *See* National Defence

Ampthill, Lord, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Analyst, certificate of. *See* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Anchor-Donaldson Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Anderson, Captain, report on Hudson bay, 1042

Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1823

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant hospital, closing of, 1995
Budget, 2837. Colourless budget drafted for political effect, 2837; Right Hon. Mr. Fielding; reciprocity; free trader in opposition, protectionist in power; tariff record of Liberal party; the tariff; average rate of duty; National policy, adoption by minister, 2838; Minister of Agriculture convert to protection; revenue tariff and incidental protection; excise and customs duty; cost of living; Minister of Interior convert to protection; tariff a tax; who pays? excise taxation, 2839; sales tax and cost of living; collection of tax on domestic and foreign goods; sales tax increase in and revenue; question as to origin of finished articles, 2740; turnover tax; automobile industry; customs duty and sales tax 52 per cent; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; reported statement of Minister of Finance on North Essex election; tariff stability, 2841; economy; balanced budget; public debt; cost of government; expenditure, rapid increase of; reciprocity; Treaty of 1854, 2842; depression following abrogation; Fordney-McCumber tariff; time inopportune for negotiations; lines of transportation; interprovincial and world trade; trade with British Empire; imports and exports; trade lines running East and West; wheat, market for, 2843; immigration, reported statement of Sir Henry Thornton; Bishop Lloyd, 2844; amendment; a political gesture; Progressive platform; attitude of opposition towards budget; western provinces, conditions in; rural income tax-payers, bank stock shareholder; field crops, value by provinces, 2845

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 534
Customs officials, Halton county, 914
Dundas street highway, qu. 708
Duties on farm and animal products, qu. 1992
Elevators, Ontario, 2037
French treaty, 455
Highways, grant to Ontario, qu. 620
North Oakville post office, 914
Pensions
Disability entitling to, 679
European war and active militia, 3726
Private abattoirs, 185-6
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 394, 429
Return, inquiry for, 2008
Sales tax on automobiles, qu. 1993, 2841
Soldier Settlement, 2029
Trade and Commerce dept. staff, 2035

Anglo-Canadian commerce. *See* British Preference; Trade

Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449. *See also* Japan.
Restriction of provincial rights 1453

Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426

Angouleme, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Animal Contagious Diseases. *See* Dairying Industry; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
(Compensation for slaughter, reduction of)
Res., 666, 2647; 1r., 2r., com., 2048; com., 2131; 3r., 2138
Sections and subjects discussed:
Abortion infective, 2867
Glanders, 2868
Hog cholera, 2867

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Internal parasites, 2867
Research work, 2867
Tuberculin test 2867
Tuberculosis, 2867
Immunization from, 2866
Watson Dr., chief bacteriologist, 2866

Animals. *See also* Live Stock
Inspection of. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.
Products, duties on, qu. 1992
Wild. *See* National Parks and Reservations
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 597

Annapolis Royal, wharf, 941

Annual Drill. *See* National Defence

Annuities, Old age. *See* Labour; Pensions

Anti-Combines bill. *See* Combines bill

Anti-Dumping. *See* Customs and Excise

Appeal Boards. *See* Pension Act Amdt bill; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Appeals
Attorney-General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2521
Canada Grain Act 781, 2045
From convictions, inquiry, 4250
Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136
Right of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Yukon Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appointments. See Civil Service

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 103 (Interim Supply—for $44,725,058.25 for 1923-24) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1539
2. Bill No. 202 (Interim Supply—for $46,558,391.58 for 1923-24) Res. 3705; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3706
3. Bill No. 252 (for $18,202,105.66 for 1922-23 and $196,870,229.79 for 1923-24) Res. 4735; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4736

Appropriations set forth in Estimates. *See* Canadian National Railway bills; Estimates

Arbitrators. *See* Judges

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4099
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1503

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Belgian Exposition, 496
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Budget, 2879. Income tax, 2879; proposed changes; exemption on account of children; community of property; earned and unearned incomes, 2880; income derived from (a) inheritance, (b) accumulated capital, (c) profession or trade; revenue; dividends, 2881
Business of the House
Questions, as orders for returns, 939
Inquiry for, 3507
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Disposal of scrap material, etc., qu. 1138
Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 528, 567
Civil Service, temporary employees made permanent, qu. 814, 1385
Code Napoleon, 1526, 1558
Contrecœur, wharf, 952
France, reconstruction, 2012
French treaty, 445, 2009, 2262
Grand Trunk, list of shareholders, 940
Greece, loan to, 2010
Imperial conference, 4653
Income tax, exemption for children, M. 1382, 2128, 2880, 4502
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4502
Levis dry dock, 1261
Liberal platform, taxation of luxuries, 2011
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2086, 2640
Return, inquiry for, 3507
Montreal post office
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Political patronage, 528
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Rhineland occupation, qu. 2696
Roumania, loan to, 2010
Trade commissioners, 856

Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290

Architects. *See* Parliament Buildings; Public Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Expeditions, 4012
Correspondence, 814
New ship, purchase of, 4702
Publication of reports, 3360
Wireless stations. *See* Yukon

Argentine Republic, Senate, 1373

Arichat, wharf, qu. 2180

Armouries. *See* National Defence

Army. *See* National Defence

Army and Navy Veterans, petition, 4536

Army Officers, settlement in Canada, 1432

Aronovici, Mr. A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris offices

Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Arsenault, Mr. H. P. *See* House of Commons, Staff

Arthur Young Company. *See* Civil Service

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4509
Budget, 3033. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff platform of 1921; failure to implement; agricultural implement duty; boots and shoes; tariff changes offset by increased sales tax, 3033; cheque and receipt taxes inconvenient and discriminatory; net increase in duties under budget of 1922; budget of 1923 disappointing; British preference; direct importation through Canadian ports; hardship to the woollen industry; sugar duty; raisins and dried currants; scrap iron; paint ingredients, 3034; potato duty; Fordney-McCumber tariff; crude petroleum bounty; cost of living; French treaty; reductions of duties on luxuries, wines and spirits; favoured nation; prohibitionists and wine duty; 3035; sales tax; pyramiding; freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement; railway receipts reduced by $20,000,000; reduction made at expense of shipper; rates on lumber, pulpwood and ties; immigration policy; Canada Colonization Association; differences of opinion amongst Liberal and Progressive members, 3036; "blue ruin" speeches; immigrants from Stornoway; northern Ontario and Quebec; agricultural and business conditions, 3037
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 2179
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4673
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 329
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4560
Housing Act, administration, 2171

Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2429
Mail carriage by subsidized steamships, 2172
Military hospitals, neurological cases, 696
Murray Stewart, vessel, purchase, 3355
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Pensions commission, report, 2128
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Public buildings, new, 4614
Sales tax, 3033-36, 4181
Soldier Settlement Board, loans, qu. 2207
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Terrebonne public building, 4614
Unemployment relief, 690
Vetcraft shops, 696
Vocational loans, 687
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3355

Artificial Silk. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Textiles, Silk

Artillery. *See* National Defence

Artisans. *See* Immigration; Labour

Arts
Academy of. *See* Royal Academy of Arts
Recognition. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Ascension Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ash Wednesday, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatics. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries; Immigration

Assassination. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Assay Office. *See* Mines and Minerals

Assessors. *See* Judges

Assignments. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Assiniboine River
Encroachments of, 999
Expenditure on dyking, etc., qu. 3264
Floods, 993, 998, 3041

Assisted Passages. *See* Immigration

Astrophysical Observatory, Victoria, 3242

Athabasca, Lake, discovery of iron ore, 2512

Athletics. *See* National Defence, Cadet training; Olympic Games

Atlanta Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Atlantic Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Atlantic Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Halifax; Ports; St. John

Attendance of Members. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2521

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Board of. *See* Board of Audit Act

Auditing. *See* Bank Act; Canadian National Railways

Auditor General. *See also* Board of Audit
Appointment, qu. 2298, 2710, 3307, 3987, 4355, 4512
Payments to temporary postmasters, 1823
Report
Referred to Public Accounts Committee, 434
Tabled, 8
Salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy. *See under this title,* Appointment

Australia
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
British immigration, preference for, 2932
Budget, 2984
Chinese immigration, 2313
Dairying industry, 3297
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Hughes, Premier, statement at Imperial Conference of 1921, 4663
Immigration policy, 1882
Land settlement, 1389
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis
Pearce, Hon. Senator, 1849
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Raisins and currants, duty, 2990, 3017, 3069, 3474
Senate, constitution of, 1370
Tariff shutting out Fiji Islands fruit, 1848
Trade treaty with, 36, 245, 1848, 2815, 2964, 2990, 3069, 3474, 3476
Visit of Minister of Trade and Commerce to, 1849. *See also* Robb
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Austria
Bean-growing industry, 2982
Senate, constitution of, 1371
West Ukrainian Republic. *See that title*

Authors. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill.

Automobiles
Accidents, 3958

Automobiles—*Con.*
Admission fee to national parks, 3942, 3943
Automobile industry, protection, 2841
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Civil servants, and, 1772
Customs and sales taxes, 2841
Duty on, 2908, 3075
Farmers, and, 100, 2812, 2874
Ford car, farmers and, 1466
Ford Motor Company
Organization and efficiency, 2544
Prices, fixing of, 2525
French treaty, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Gasoline
Price, 2547
Short measure, 810
Highways. *See* Canada Highways
Immigration of United States garage owners, 1416
India, shipments to, 508
Insurance, 3147, 3977
Ottawa, in, 2874
Purchase of by instalments, 2874
Railways and, 1619
Sales tax on, qu. 1993, 2841
Saskatchewan in, 82, 148
Taxation, 52%, 2841
Western provinces, 1889

Autonomy. *See* Canada's participation in War; Imperial Conference

Aviation. *See* Air Service

Aylesworth, Sir Allen, decisions. *See* Disallowance

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Bacon. *See also* Live Stock
Bacon industry, 2864
British market, 2864
Canadian, selling price in Great Britain, 1905
Corn-fed, 2865
Danish, 2864, 2865
Grades, 590.
Hog grading, 590
Imports and exports, 938
Pork products, and, 1978
Price of, 2585, 2933
Salty, 3301
Wiltshire sides, 2864

Bait. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Baker, the Late Colonel G. H., M.P. Memorial to
Special Committee, report, 435, 730, 1256, 1991

Balance of Trade. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Annual training, 875

Baldwin, Mr. W. K.—*Con.*
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1822
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1054
Immigration policy, 1247
Labour, demand for, 1248
Military expenditure, 875
Rural mail service
Carriers, remuneration, 1822
Spur lines, 1826
Tariff protection, 1249
Taxation, increase of, 1822
Woollen industry, 3470

Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824

Baldwin Tinplate Industry, 2819. *See* also Tinplate

Balfour, Colonel N. H. *See* Canadian National Railways

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Roumania

Bamfield, B.C., public building, 1024

Bananas
Production in Fiji Islands, 1848
Trust, 2979

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Address in reply, 99. Mr. Carroll and prosperity of the western farmer, 99-100; farmers and automobiles, 100; condition of the West, 100-101; causes of emigration; mixed farming, 101
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035
Budget, 2736. Liberal tariff policy; amendments moved when in opposition; high cost of living; duties upon necessaries of life; reciprocity; tariff plank chief issue in last election, 2736; rejection of Conservative policy by western provinces; low tariff sentiment; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks almost identical; mandate clear and unmistakable; Tory reactionaries in garb of official Liberalism; tariff; protection responsible for immigration; high prices; reduced purchasing power, 2737; United States largest free trade area in world; per capita customs tax; United States and Canada; prices, comparison of United States and Canada; mail order catalogues, 2738; clothing; sewing machines; paints; agricultural implements; harness, 2739; nails; wire fencing and poultry netting; washing machines; dairy supplies; tools; rubber boots safety razors; prosperity impossible with present production costs; barriers obstructing development of natural industries, 2740
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, 3251
Drawbacks on steel, coal and woollen goods, qu., 1994
Dredging, Grassy Narrows, 1013
Emerson public building, 4628
Grain for exhibition purposes, 1455
Highways, federal grant, 519
Homesteads, improvements, 3251
Indian Affairs, department, salaries, 2165
Indians
Manitoba, 2153
St. Peter's reserve, 2153
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4283
Lake Manitoba, flooding, 999
Masters and mates, 2610
Parliament buildings, Commons chamber, lighting, 1728
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Penitentiaries, 771
Privilege—titles—amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1308
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Royal military college, expenditure, 4628
Rural credit system, 4035
St. Andrew's dam, fishway, 1000
Selkirk wharf, 1000
Shipping combines, 4283
Soldier settlement, 2021
Steamship services, 2173, 2174
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655

Banff National Park, 3434
Calgary Power Company and, 3442, 3750, 3938
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electric plant, 3949
Hotel, 3435
Power privileges, 496, 3750
Water powers, 3420

Banff-Windermere Highway, opening, 3584

Bank Act. *See* also Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Credit; Finance
Revision, 26, 70, 77, 170, 496, 634, 638, 644, 858, 4014, 4035. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget
Alberta legislature, res., 2084
Canadian Council of Agriculture, 255, 4016, 4041, 4045
Proposed extension of charters for twelve months M. (Mr. Spencer) 683, ruled out of order, 643

Bank Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Bank Act; Banks and Banking
Res., 1167, 1310; 1r., 2r., 1314; ref. to

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Com., 1314; com., 4013, 4014, 4077, 4133; 3r., 4162; Senate amdts. 4058
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agency, 4093-8
Agreement of sale, 4138
Amendments to Bank Act, 4052, 4056
Antagonism of financiers and farmers, 4044
Assets, sale to another bank, 4134
Audit, chartered accountants, 1311. *See also under this bill,* Shareholders
Australian Commonwealth bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars, 4014
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) extending charters for one year 4017, neg. 4075
Amdt. (Mr. Good) to M. for 3r., 4141, neg. 4147
Bank circulation redemption fund continued
Amdt. (Mr. Coote) interest on, neg. 4093
Bank loans, approval by directors, 4098
Bank may sell assets to another bank, 4134
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Bank statements, 4020, 4030, 4047, 4085, 4139
Banking and Commerce Committee
Evidence, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Banking monopoly, 4045, 4047, 4050, 4087 4103, 4157, 4166
Banking system, 4016, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Business and powers of the bank, 4093
Amdt, agency (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4093; withdrawn, 4094
Amdt., insurance, agents for (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4094, neg. 4098
Canadian Bankers' Association, representation before Com. 4058
Cash reserves in Dominion notes, 4091
Centralization, 4079
Circulation, 4092
Security of, 1312
Co-operative banking, 4067
Criticism of the banks, 4039
Currency, 4072
Depreciated, 4027
National, 4048
Definitions, 4014
Delay in 1909, 1910 and 1911, 4033, 4035

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Directors, 1313, 4084
Amdt. (Mr. Good) 4084 neg. 4084
Attendance at meetings, 1313
Qualifications of, 4077
Discount, 4509
Discussion, opportunity for, 4063, 4225
Dividends, 4039, 4121, 4124
Division between East and West, 4040
Divisions
Bank charters, renewal of, amdt. (Mr. Good), 4141, 4147
Interest rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest rate, maximum, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Right of association of officers, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Failures, 1312, 4037
"Fantastic" schemes, 4038
Federal reserve system, 4069
Financial system, re-adjustment of, 4053, 4057
First lien upon seed grain and crop, 4102
First meeting of subscribers, 4075
Gold standard, 4021, 4027, 4047, 4093
Government audit, 4020, 4030, 4087
Government inspection, 1310
"Gramophones" 4058
Hicks, Mr. T., and Merchants Bank, 4059
Industrial conditions, 4054
Insurance, agency, 4093, 4509
Interest at 7 per cent may be charged, 4103
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4105, neg. 4119
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4125, neg. 4131; 4149; neg. 4149
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. on div. 4148
Interest rates, 4119, 4020, 4028, 4047, 4050, 4062, 4065, 4509
Locality and security, 4120
Interlocking directorates, 4022, 4157
Investment bankers, 4157
Liberal and Conservative union, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245
Loans
Live stock, 4103
Officials, to, 1313
Wholesale dealers, 4101
Merchants' Bank investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. on div. 4161
Mergers, 1311, 4031, 4050, 4071, 4072, 4080, 4134

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Money
Nature and function, 4020, 4055
Purchasing power, 4067
Trust, 4026
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4125, 4142
Mortgages and hypothecs of realty and agreement of sale, 4099
Property exempt from seizure, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4099, withdrawn, 4133
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Com. not debatable
Ruling (Mr. Speaker), 4013
National currency, 4048
Notes, issue of, 4092, 4122
Officers
Appointment of, 4048
Right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4084, neg. 4085; 4161, neg. on div. 4161
One vote for each share, 4085
Particulars of act of incorporation, 4075
Pension fund, 1313
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
Price level, stabilization of, 4069
Prices, control of, 4047
Prior claim of bank over unpaid vendor, 4103
Prior liens, 1312
Private bankers, licensing of, 1314
Production and consumption, 4054
Profits, 4121, 4124
Property, 1313
To be sold within certain time, 4101
Protection of the public, 1312
Questionaire and answers, 4062, 4128
Re-discount system, 4081
Returns of interest rates charged, 4119
Revision, postponement of. *See* Bank Act
Rural credits, 4015, 4028, 4035, 4037, 4039, 4041, 4066. *See also* Credits
Shareholders' audit, 1311, 4037, 4087
Auditors to report to Minister, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4090, neg. 4091
Government audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 4090
Short title, 4014
Small banks, 4077
Stability, 4078
Statement of liabilities, assets, etc., 4085
Stock, allotment of, 1312
Taxes, refusal to pay, 4099
"Unholy alliance," 4031
United Farmers of Ontario, co-operative stores, 4068
Unpaid vendor, 4509
Warehouse receipts and bills of lading, 4101
Weyburn Security bank, 4509. *See also* Banks and Banking

Banking and Commerce Committee
Bank Act, proceedings, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Inquiry by, 2937
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Members in attendance at, 2167, 2171
Personnel, 2639, 2926, 3261
Reports
Inquiry, 2612
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Rural credits, 2929. *See also* Credits
Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Bankruptcy
Farmers, 1412. *See also* Credits
Number of failures, 648

Bankruptcy Act. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.
Administration, 780
Amendment or abrogation, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1490, withdrawn 1528
Assignments
Preliminary expense, 1412
Since 1916, 1495
Galipeault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Girouard, Judge, law of 1864, 1497
Perrault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Taschereau, Hon. L. A. 1499
Assignments, 1916-1922, qu. 937

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Trustees; custodian; sales of property; landlord's privileges; examination of debtor; composition; discharge of trustees; claim of wife; examination of relatives; distribution between assignment and composition; doubt as to interpretation)
1r., 2252-2253; 2r., 3085-3091; com. 3091, 3209; 3r., 3222; Senate amendments, 4201
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Abstract of receipts and disbursements, 3116
Application by trustee for discharge, 3116
Assignment
Authorized, 3106
For general benefit of creditors, 3110

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Assignment—*Con.*
Form of, 3110
Bankruptcy proceedings, cost of, 3090
British North America Act, 3095
Canadian Credit Men's Association, 3088, 3093
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 3093
Commencement of act, 3127
Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement, 3110, 3209
Debtor
Conditional discharge, powers of court, 3125
Description of property, 3115
Discharge of, 3086
Examination of, 3124
Examination of bankrupt by official receiver, 3121
Farmers, 3211
Claims of, 3214
Fees of attorney and trustees, 3087, 3090
Hypothecated immovable property, sales of, 3114
Jurisdiction, 3095
Landlords, claim of, 3086
Marriage settlement, 3087
Married woman, claim, 3087, 3121
Meetings of creditors, 3117
Objections to, statement, 3098
Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice, 3126, 3220
Official receivers, 3087
Petitioning creditor secured, 3108
Priority of claim, 3214
Proof of debt, 3119
Publication of notice, etc., 3110
Quebec, sales in, 3114
Release of security, 3116
Remedy of creditor against property, 3109
Repeal of, 3091
Right of manufacture, 3114
Secured creditor to value security, 3119
Security to be furnished by trustee, 3111
Short title, 3091
Stay of proceedings, 3109
Tariff of costs and fees, 3126
Trustees, 1412, 3088, 3113, 3210
Remuneration of, 3116
Vestment of property in, 3109
Voting by proxy, 3119
Wife's claim, 3087, 3121
Banks and Banking. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Advances to chartered banks, 4249, 4408. *See also* Finance Act Amdt. bill
Agricultural credits. *See* Credits, Rural
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Bank Note Act, 4093
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank of Commerce
Aird, Sir John, 1407
Domestic debts, 1343
Overgovernment and taxation, 1391
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1409
Bank clearings, increase of, 3055
Bank directors dominating industrial and commercial affairs, 4022
Bank draft tax, 3925
Bank notes
Bank Note Act, 4093
Issues, 4408
Substitution for national notes, 4408
Bank returns
False, 4030
M. (Mr. Coote) 3264
Bank robberies, 776
Bank statements, 4020, 4047
Banking system, 634, 4016, 4017, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Borrowings, 4030
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Capital, control of, 4026. *See also* capital
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739, 4406
Circulation
"Bank specials" 1739
Security of, 1312
Combinations, 2578, 4083
Commission on banking and credit, 2929
Cost of living and, 1409
Credits. *See also that title*
Control, 631, 2725
Financial machinery, control of, 2725
Monopoly, 2725
System, 1252
Dividends, 4121, 4124
Dollar, stabilizing of, 4666
Dominion Bank, statement as to economic conditions, 1394
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Employees, married, 4084
Farmers' bank, 4034
Farmers
Credits. *See* Credits
Pressure on, 1202
Shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Treatment of, 2929
Federal jurisdiction, 2592
Federal reserve bank, 4067
Financial influence in parliament, 2733
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Gold, percentage of national wealth, 2720

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Government audit, 4020
Hail insurance, 4509
Immigration and, 1133, 4042
Interest rates, 635, 2812, 2962, 4020
Western Canada, 1088, 1440
Interlocking directorates, 636, 4022, 4157
Legislation, 3060. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Lobbyists, 4029
Merchants' Bank, 70, 1310, 3990, 4020, 4025, 4028, 4029, 4031, 4034, 4036, 4042, 4047, 4049, 4057, 4058, 4066, 4087, 4139, 4145, 4150, 4297
Government action, 2576
Investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Proposed resolution, 4068, 4069
Merger with Bank of Montreal, 4031
Mergers, 1311, 4019, 4031, 4134. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Money. *See also* Credits; Money
Nature and function, 4020
Origin and meaning of exchange, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 4666
Monopoly, 636, 4018
Montreal, Bank of
Directorships, 4022-25
Merchants' Bank merger, 4031
Statement of agricultural exports, 1390
National City bank, bulletin on potatoes, 2820
National Land bank, 4366
Nationalization of banking system, 2728
Northern Crown bank, 4080
Note issues, 4405. *See also under this title,* Bank notes
Nova Scotia, Bank of, 4079
Officers, right to organize, 4084, 4161
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Ottawa, Bank of, 4081
Payments in bank notes instead of gold, 4249
Penny Bank of Toronto. *See that title*
Profits, 1209, 4121, 4124. *See also under this title,* Dividends
Promissory notes, taxation, 3923
Quebec savings bank, 4183, 4392, 4405
Rural bank shareholders, 2846
Rural credits. *See* Credit
Salaries and wages, 4084
Savings deposits, increase of, 3055
Security market and, 4157
Small banks, establishment of, 4019

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Toronto, Bank of
Gooderham, President, debt, aggregate and per capita, 2721
Union Bank, position of, 4225, 4250, 4272
M. (Mr. Forke) to adjourn the House to consider, 4296; withdrawn, 4300
United States Federal Reserve bank, 3059, 4106, 4407
Universities and educational institutions, 4025, 4073
Vancouver, Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Weyburn Security bank, 2813, 4081, 4122, 4509
Widows and orphans, stockholders, 2743

Banting, Dr. F. G., discoverer of insulin, 703, 1285-1287
Annuity, 4645, 4676
Expression of nation's gratitude, 4437
Patenting of insulin, 2077

Barnardo, Dr., child immigration. *See* Immigration, Child

Barnhill, Mr., 60

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D. *See* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry

Barrow, Hon. E. D., Asiatic immigration, 1900

Bartlett, Captain, Hudson Bay railway, 1017

Basic Industries. *See* Industries

Battlefields Memorials. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic sites; Martell; Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge Memorial

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 132. Necessity for economizing time of session, 132; Mr. Hoey's speech, 133; government ownership of railways, 133-134; Sir Henry Thornton, 134; national railways and political patronage; regional administration of Canadian National Railways, 135; Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136; sectionalism; potato-growers and grain growers, 136; freight rates on potatoes, 137-138; lumber rates on; Canadian ports, development, 139; the Conservative party in Quebec, 140; achievements of government; Near East crisis; Imperial centralization, 141; League of Nations; amdt. and sub-amdt.; amdt. of Mr. Fielding in 1921, 142; standard of living, 143; waste of time in legislating, 144
Automobiles, insurance, 3977

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-3127, 3220
Banks, federal jurisdiction, 2592
Belle River harbour, 4607
Board of Commerce Act, 2590
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3500
Boulay, Mlle., postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750
British North America Act, amendment of, 2592
British preference, limitation to Canadian ports, 1757, 2678
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act amdt. bill, 3973
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3377
Canadian National Railways
Advances
Additional amount, 3376
$73,000,000, 3629
Branch lines construction bill, 4304
Express and electric lines bill, 2481
Management, responsibility and powers, 3638, 3697
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 3197
Paris offices, 3637, 3697
Providence, R. I., building, 1755
St. John
Station, 3645
Train shed, 3188
Terminals
Atlantic division, qu. 1363
Maritime regions, qu. 1662
United States, 1755
Toronto office building, 3629
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3955, 3960
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Combines bill, 2589
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2590
Privy Council decisions, 2590
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4210-4217
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Criminal Code, combines clause, 2592
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2362
Distressed seamen, 3974
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Exchequer Court, judgeship, 2499
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4350
False Creek bridge, 3375
Freight rates, Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136, 3239
French Treaty bill, 2243
Fuel supply, 803

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Government publications, waste, 1734
Grain and grain trade
Shipments from Portland, St. John and Halifax, qu. 1484
Shipping rates on, 2517
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick wharves transferred to Dominion govt. 947
Nova Scotia, 942, 4566
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Historic sites, 3407
Hoppe leases, 3128
Hudson Bay railway, construction vote, 4683, 4685
Immigration
Maritime provinces and, 1131
Policy, 1130-32
Immigration Act Amdt, bill, 2430
Exclusion, 2436
Ship's crews, 2435
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4497
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt, bill, 3977
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Lake Grain Rates inquiry, 247
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4173, 4178
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Lumber, sales tax, 3181, 4418
Marine dept. salaries, 3373
Maritime provinces, secession, 1757, 2245
Martello tower, St. John, 3444
Matapedia bridge, repairs, qu. 4184
Motion, increasing taxation, 3936
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2110, 2196, 2437 2462, 3984
British system, 2438
Consolidation of the law, 2437
Judges, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Negro Point breakwater, 4587
Official report of debates, abolition of, 1734
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Penitentiaries, 774
Petition of Right Act Amdt bill, 3128
Pilots, pensions, 3359
Preston, W. T. R., Mr., qu. 206, 247
Printing bureau new building, 1733, 1737
Public buildings, renting or building, 1734
Public ownership, 3640
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4350
Railway Commission, 3188
Railways, surveys and inspections, 3648

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Registration of ships purchased from foreigners, 3973
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. John
Harbour improvements, 2676
Station and train shed, 3188, 3645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4418
Salmon river protection work, 946
Secession, Nova Scotia 1757, 2245
Shipping combines, statement in Toronto Globe qu. 1362
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3374
Steamship services, 3397
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies, 3390
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Wheat board, 2592

Bay of Fundy, icebreakers, 2615

Bayfield, Ont., pier, 981

Bean-Growing Industry, competition from abroad, 2981

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of the C.P.R.
Appointment as President, 373
Bank director, 4024
Immigration 1337-8

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Assiniboine river, flooding 998
Auditor General, appointment, qu. 2298
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2414
Drainage, 3257
Grain dockage, 783
Grand Trunk arbitration, payments to Hon. Howard G. Taft, qu. 1157
Immigration
Empire settlement scheme, 1461
Policy, 1461
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1092
Indians, St. Pie reserve, fencing, 2154
Lake Grain Rates bill 4285
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 299, 305
Political patronage, 3348
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Public Works expenditure, Manitoba, 998
Sawdust pollution of rivers and streams, 3364
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655
Wheat, grading of, 305

Beck, Sir Adam. *See* Hydro Electric Power.

Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, qu. 283, 816

Bee-Keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675

Beef. *See* Live stock; Meats

Beer. *See* Liquor.

Beet Sugar. *See* Sugar.

Behring Sea Fisheries. *See* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 704, 4438
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Business of the House, 3750
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates, time of presentation, 4703
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4565
Health, Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2170
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 2168
St. John, 4614
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Leprosy, treatment of, 702
Pharmaceutical preparations, 3261
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Venereal diseases, 705
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Insulin treatment for diabetes, 704
Maple products industry, 1810
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Medical advisory boards, 677, 697
Medical inspection of immigrants, 702
Meighen, Right Hon., alleged speech in North Essex, 670, 708
Military hospitals, 670
Mental cases, 671
Neurological cases, 696
Nursing hospitals, 686
Motions, opportunity to speak to, 3583
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 1136, 2114, 2116, 2124
Deportation of convicted alien, 2123

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 698, 3149. *See also under this title,* Narcotic Drugs
Prosecutions, 698
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401, 3748, 3848-85
District appeal boards, 4703
Senate amdts. 4744
Pension regulations, review of, 3851
Pensions
Appeal boards, 677, 681, 697, 4703
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166 3706, 3718, 3735
Fenian raid and Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, Board of
Interpretation of act, 2640
Report, 4736
Salaries, etc., 2168, 3742
Royal Commission, 288
Recommendations, legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 2983, 3400
Reports
First, interim, on second part of investigation, 1631, 2166, 2167, 2926
Printing, 1992, 2128, 2983
Opportunity for discussion, 674
Printing, 3401
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Printing bureau, new building, M. to reduce item, 1730
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Public buildings, new, departmental, 1729
Redistribution committee report, 4736
Returned soldiers, emigration to United States, 691
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3582, 3743, 3892, 4734, 4751
St. John river, pollution of, 701
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Department
Estimates, 668, 2166, 2168
Expenditure, 3893
Reduction of, 2032
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Vancouver employees, 3085, 3822
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Hospitals, Brant House and Euclid Hall, closing, 1995, 4075
Interest on war service gratuity, 689
Operating expenses, etc., 690
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment relief, 690, 695
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3648, 3745, 3892, 4750
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4727

Belanger, Mr. U., agent at St. Moise, 1489

Belgium. *See also* Germany Reparations
Belgian exposition, 496
Butter, export to, 2217
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration from, 1085, 1096, 1173. *See also* Immigration
Imports and exports, 1977
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with, 246

Bell, the late Dr. Alexander Graham, contributions to scientific knowledge, 1287

Bell, Major Graham A. *See* Railways and Canals

Bell, the late Dr. Robert, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Belle River Harbour, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610

Belleville harbour commissioners, qu. 490

Belloc, Mr. Hilaire, European situation, 1231

Benoit, Mr. A. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, Mr. H. Milburn, qu. 1138
Grand Trunk arbitration
Doherty, Right Hon. Charles J., pension, qu. 1029
Purchase, arbitrators, fees, profit and loss, qu. 1257
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029; qu. 1661
Introduction of, 3
Judges
Pensions, qu. 492
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Metric system, qu. 914
Welland canal, towing, qu. 4132

Bernasconi, Mr., report of, 4723

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Patents of Invention bill

Bernier, Captain. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Berry Containers. *See* Fruit

Best, Mr. C. H., associate of Dr. Banting, 703, 4439

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Betting
Tax on in Great Britain, 2824

Beverages, tax on, 2979, 3046. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206

Big Bay Point, wharf, 981

Big Interests. *See also* Combines bill
Political parties and, 2856, 3070

Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C. *See* Canadian National Railways

Bill of Exchange. *See* Taxation

Bill of Rights. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills, *See* their individual titles
For Private Bills. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Bilodeau, Mr. Jean, qu. 1487

Binder Twine, 2780
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Duty removal of, 2965, 4379
Imports and exports, 2965
Industry
Discrimination, 2964
History of, 2965
Manufacture, amendment of act respecting, 3231
Prices and abolition of duty, 2965, 4379
Production in Canada, 2780

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Bindings. *See* Books; Public Libraries

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Hawkesbury government offices, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Judges' salaries, qu. 491
Ottawa river, Pointe Fortune water power, qu. 1974.
Peat investigation at Alfred, qu. 1487

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Biological Board Act Amdt. Bill (Representation of Marine and Fisheries department and fishing industries)
Res., 1r., 3820; 2r., com., 3974; 3r., 3974

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Agricultural conditions, 1861
Agriculture, economic organization, 1863

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4029, 4150
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. 4150, neg. 4161
Point of order, interruptions, 4064
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, 4013
Bright, John, free trade in Great Britain, 3051
Budget, 2787. Minister of Agriculture and Moose Jaw election; speech of Mr. Raymond; tariff stability, 2787; taxation, experiments in perpetuation of crude methods; income tax, costly and inequitably graduated; well-to-do not bearing fair share; unearned and earned incomes; war profits; inheritance tax, 2788; business profits tax; sales tax; luxury tax; taxation, indirect; taxing the consumer; necessities of life, taxation of; apportionment of taxes in Great Britain, 2789; emigration to the United States; Winnipeg *Free Press,* statement of; Minister of Agriculture and Free Press; Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, reported statement as to emigration in New York *Tribune,* 2790; taxation and immigration; agriculture pushed into background by industrialism; governmental neglect of the farmer; world organization of farmers; National Farmers' Union of Great Britain; Farmers' Bloc in United States; Progressive Party in Canada, 2791; future of farmers' organizations; principle of protection; no difference between Tory and Liberal budgets; tariff variation not over two and a half per cent; 2792; the Big-endians and the Little-endians, two parties but one policy; total of tariff taxation for 50 years; tribute to Minister of Finance; violation of pledges by Liberal party; Progressive party, policy, 2793; political ideals; patriotism and love of country, a transformed country-side; Mr. Fielding's budget speeches past and future, 2794
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4688
Civil Service, deputy ministers, 368
Combines bill, 2625
Crowsnest pass agreement, Progressives and, 2855
Drainage of agricultural lands, 3257
Emigration to the United States
Meighen, Mr., reported statement in New York Tribune, 2790
Winnipeg, from, 1975

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Great Britain, free trade and protection, 1862, 3051
Hemp bounty bill, 4388
Homesteaders, relinquishment of holdings, 3257
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Construction vote, 4688
M. (Mr. Knox) 1037
Income tax, total assessment, qu. 2393
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Merchants' Bank merger, 4029, 4030, 4031, 4050, 4061
Napoleonic wars, problems after, 1233
Non-confidence, M., (Mr. Irvine) 225
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3567, 4387
Political parties and big interests, 2856
Progressive party, economic not political, 1863
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 760
Rules of the House, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1303
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Taxation, luxury taxes, collections, qu. 2393
West and protected industries, 1222-3

Bird Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations bill

Birmingham, Bishop of, on immigration, 1205

Birth Rate, 1197. *See also* Population
Decline in, 1195

Bituminous Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Bituminous Sands, Alberta, 3198

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Address in reply, 85. Visit of their Excellencies to the Yukon, 85; the Yukon territory, its history, and mineral wealth, 85-89
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3112
Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1557
Liquor law, administration of, 2419
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2419, 2428
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3683
Chinese Immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service list, publication, qu. 3134
Contracts with newspapers and printing companies, 1974, 2394, 2614
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155

Black, Mr. George—*Con.*
Customs and Excise dept. legal work, 856
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, qu. 938
Farmers, shareholders in banks, qu. 1486
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Income tax, farmers paying, qu. 1486
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Mining fees, Yukon, 1636
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2467
Judges, Yukon Territory, 2458
Secretary of State, administration, 2458, 2467
Northwest territories
Administration, 3949
Wireless telegraph service, 3945
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 2927
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3544
Pension Act Amdt. bill
District review board
Appeals, amdt., 3875, neg. 3881
Appointments to, amdt. 3875, neg. 3875
Pensions
Commuted, qu. 4132
European war and active militia, 3732
Royal commission, qu. 207
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Quartz-mining claims, Yukon territory, 249
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1143
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Vancouver, Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 767, 4247
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516
Minerals, exhibit at British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Quartz-mining claims, 249
Telegraphs, qu. 1662, qu. 2206, 3945
Revenue from, qu. 2417

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4034
Bayfield harbour, 981
Customs and excise taxes and collections, qu. 814
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Income tax collection, cost, qu. 733
Merchants' bank case, 4034
Toronto seed branch building, 4623

Black, Mr. W. J. *See* Immigration

Black Point, N.S., breakwater, 941

Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M.P., references to, 4, 6, 8, 102

Blackfeet Indians. *See* Indians

Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856

Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513

Blind. *See* Canadian National Institute; Soldiers

Blind River wharf, 981

Blondin, Mr. Charles E., Pierreville postmaster, qu. 4511

"Blue Ruin" speeches. *See* Immigration

Board of Audit Act (Inquiry into auditing and accounting system) Res., 4249; 4355; 1r., 2r., com., 4356; com., 3r., 4369; Senate amdts., 4733

Board of Commerce. *See also* Combines
Repeal of Act, 2521
"Wooden gun" 2564

Board of Grain Commissioners. *See* Grain

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boats. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine and Fisheries; Vessels

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Indemnity of members, 4008, 4236
Joint Committee on legislation, report, 3887, 4007
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Members, attendance of, 4008
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-46
Deduction for non-attendance, 4244

Bolshevism
Bolshevists, socialists, communists and anarchists, 2744
Children of Russian and Polish parents at Welland, 2844
Discontent and, 2982
Farmers, 4045
Oriental immigration, 505
Russia, example of, 2744
Trade unions bulwark against, 2887

Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138

Bonaventure
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Railway facilities, 4186

Bonded Warehouses. *See* Liquor

Bonds. *See* Canadian National Railways; Finance; Loans

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-Making. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Books. *See also* Copyright Act
Purchase of. *See* Library of Parliament
Sales tax on, 1870

Bootlegging. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.; Liquor; Tobacco

Boots and Shoes. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Duty, 2849, 3033
French treaty, 1990, 2240
Prices, increased, 2873
Sales tax, 2999
United States markets, free entry to, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499

Borden, Camp. *See* Camp Borden

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Administration, 2815
Canada, constitutional development, 4465
National debt, diminution of, 2920
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Treaties, signing of, 4465

Border States. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Botany Yarn. *See* Textiles, Silk

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Agriculture department, employees, 815
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3562
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere experimental farm, qu. 1028

Boucher, Mr. Aime (Yamaska)
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1510

Boucher, Mrs., postmistress, Pierreville, qu. 4511

Boudreau, the late Mr. Rodolphe, 1805

Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613

Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750

Boulay, Mr. Hermengilde, Sayabec post office, 3750

Boundaries. *See* International Boundaries; Surveys
Forest areas. *See* Dominion Forest Reserves

Boundary Waters, Pollution of, 700, 3362

Bounties, 2948. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Advances to be repayable, 4369, 4376
Agricultural and manufactured products, 1196
Agriculture and, 3237
Artificial silk, 2931
Binder twine, 4369
Copper bars or rods, 2646, 2709, 2734, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 2944, 2958, 3017, 3031, 3035, 3069, 3231, 4369, 4376
Cordage, 4369
Fishing, report on, 911
Hemp, 2647, 2709, 2778, 2780, 2823, 2827, 2931, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3017, 3031, 3911, 3963, 4376
Extension of time, 3911
Resolutions, 3911
Increased, demand for, 3076
Iron and steel, 4371, 4381
Linen thread, 2647, 2897
Loans, repayable, 4369, 4376
Manila fibre, 2657, 3231, 3242, 4369
News, 3062
Oil. *See under this head,* Petroleum
Permanent when established, 2957
Petroleum, 2648, 2657, 2949, qu. 3262, 3914, 3963, 4392
Administration of, 780
Protection and, 2778
Wheat, on, 1196
Wool, 2866

Bounties on Copper Bars or Rods, Act Respecting Res. 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4369; 3r., 4376
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4369, neg., 4376

Bounties on Manila Fibre, Repeal Bill Res. 2657, 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 3r., 4369

Bourassa, Mr. Henri, Nationalist party, 2924

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis county postmasters, qu. 519
Nolin, Mrs. J., postmistress, St. David, 1489
Quarantine station, Levis, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Boville, Mr. T. C., service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Bowder, Mr. W. R. *See* Immigration

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Grain surveys, qu. 4131

Boy Scouts Association, 114, 879

Boyer, Dr. G. F., appointment, qu. 2418

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Ammunition, 887
Received from England, 1741
Annual training, 874
Annuities, old age, 1640
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Cost of at various ages, 1641
Postmasters as agents, 1642
Atherley bridge, 3648
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1506, 1513
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3085-3127
Big Bay point wharf, 981
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 1162
Empire day adjournment, 2795
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Gazette, printing, 1709
Canada-West Indies Steamship service, 3384
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden, 1749, 4565
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Canadian National railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4327
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620
Paris offices, 3630
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Canadian Press, Limited, 1464
Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031
Combines bill, 2621-37
Commissioners, appointment of, 2629
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2144
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2053
Debates, official report, omission of undiscussed item in supply, 1638
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740
Evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, bill, 2053
Excise taxes, use of postage stamps, 1820-1
Exhibitions, 1465
Federal printing company, 1623
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church), amdt. (Mr. Carroll) 1281

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Grain elevators, Montreal, qu. 1663
Harbours and rivers
Nova Scotia, 4564
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 969
Highways
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Hamilton-Brantford, 2493
Statement of, 3174
Hopper barge construction, 3351
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1323
Agreement, 1104
McRae, General, salary, 1324
Policy, 1095
Income tax, unearned income, 2882
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1629, 1655, 1706, 2062.
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3147
Labour
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Department
Estimates, 1621
Staff, reduction, 1671
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, printing, 1622-1625, 1709
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Lindsay arsenal, 883
L'Islet wharf, 970
Lunenberg harbour, dredging, 4578
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Matane harbour improvements, 970
Meaford-Clarksburg highway, 4565
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater, claim, 4574
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden 1749, 1777, 4565
Militia payments, qu. 205, qu. 344, 386
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184, 2193
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Old age annuities, 1640, 1683. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Ontario government savings office, interest rate, 1697
Parliament buildings, 1719
Committee on, 1724
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723, 1726
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2075, 2079, 2086, 2099, 2129
Peat, experiments, 3199
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
European war and active militia, 3739

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Widows, 681
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, new building, 1733
Quebec wharves, 977
Railway lands, purchases or sales, 1739
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744
Revenue and postage stamps, 1820-1
Rural mail service.
Carriers, remuneration, 1780, 1785
Spur lines, 1822, 1826
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506
Steamer Murray Stewart, purchase, 3356
Steamship services, 2173
Canada-West Indies, 3384
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Toronto union station, 4326
Trade Mark and Designs bill, 2063
Trent canal, qu. 205, 3648
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Unemployment relief, 690, 1655, 2169
Vocational loans, 687

Bracken, Premier of Manitoba, on immigration, 1123

Bran and Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Branch Lines. *See* Canadian National Railways

Brandeis, Judge Louis, on banking, 4022

Brandon, Man., damage by flood, 999.

Brandy. *See* Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Brant Military Hospital, closing, 677, 1995, 4075

Brantford binder twine industry. *See* Binder Twine; Hemp Bounties bill

Brazil, constitution of Senate, 1373

Breadner, Mr. R. W. *See* Taxation, Commissioner of

"Breezes Blowing in Mulberry Trees." *See* Secession

Brenner, Meyer, release on parole, 1975

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herd system, 577, 586, 3303
Bacon, salting, 3301
Cheese grading, 3295
Experimental farms, 483

Brethen, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Grain, new varieties, introduction, 483
Health of animals, 586
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Potatoes, prices, 2821
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 751
Shire horses, gift from Great Britain, 2253
Weights and Measures inspector, qu. 492

Breweries. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Liquor

Brick. *See* Building

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Atherley, 3648
Buffalo and Fort Erie, 1834
Burlington channel, 2682
Burrard inlet, 4709
Calumet-Bryson, 1014
Clair, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 4590
Edmundston, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 1014, 2342, 4589
False Creek, 3375, 4708
Fredericton, 3645, 4310
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Grand Etang, 4589
Hawkesbury, 4589
International, 2342, 3647
Interprovincial and, 2342
Isle Perrot, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Kingston, 2682
Lachine canal, Montreal, 2299
McAdam-Vanceboro, 2342
Matapedia, Restigouche river, 1014
Repairs, qu. 4184
Michigan Central at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Montreal-Longueuil, 2086, 2615, 2640
Report of harbour commissioners, 3507
Orleans island, 3646
Ottawa-Hull, 1015, 4590
Roads and bridges, 1014
St. Croix river, 2342
St. John and Quebec railway, 3644
St. John river, 2342
Second Narrows, Vancouver, qu. 1258, 4708
Trent Valley canal, qu. 205
Vancouver-North Vancouver, 1008

Bright, John
British free trade movement, 3050
Repeal of Corn Laws, 3013

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Patents of Invention bill, 2096, 2103
Postmasters, appointment of, 1828-9
Woodbridge postmaster, 1828

Britain. *See* Great Britain

British Admiralty, war claims. *See* War Claims

British Ambassador at Washington. *See also* Treaties
Signature of treaties, 2403
Halibut Fishery Treaty, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664

British and Foreign News Service, 4712

British Columbia
Aerial forest patrol, 1776
Agricultural conditions, 2769
Agriculture, increased production, 1432
Associated boards of trade, letter of Hon. Mr. Carvell, 1915
Bootlegging, 2419. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Attorney General and, 2407
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Columbia Prohibition Association, 2408
Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Bill, 2284
Correspondence, 1032, 1307
Canadian air force, 1748, 1776
Canadian Northern railway guarantee, 1946
Canadian Pacific railway, construction, 1916
Chilliwack reclamation project, 3431
Chinese immigration. *See that title*
Civil Service appointments in, 372
Claims against federal government, 708
Coal
Competition of fuel oil with, 1245
Deposits, investigation, 3198, 3202
Production, 1244
Copper bounty, 2734
Creosoting industry, 1245
Creosoted piling, use in, qu. 1137
Debt, per capita, 2941
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061
Dredging, 1014, 4590
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Experimental farms, 457
Fisheries
Commission, 1453, 1540, 3372
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540
Japanese engaged in, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Forests, fungus and insect control, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1003
Freight rates
Discrimination, 1936
Equalization of, 1911, 1914
Fruit-growing industry, 2942
Fuel oil, importation, 1245
Geological survey explorations, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 1002, 2671

British Columbia—*Con.*
Highways, 2341, 2941, 3186. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Hindu franchise and, 4640-4651
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1096, 1112, 1327
Indian army officers, settlement in, 1096
Indians, 2152, 2163
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Schools, 2164
Iron ore deposits, 2505
Japanese fishermen, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Kootenay flats reclamation scheme, 3431
Labour conditions, 1125
Legislation, disallowance of, 1261
Life-saving appliances, 1659
Liquor
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
Exportation of, qu. 1260
Importation, 2404. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Liquor laws, administration, 2419, 2423
Corruption, charge of, 2412-13
Ottawa Citizen, editorial, 2412
Public accounts com. investigation, 2410-13
Purchases, 2410
Warehouses, qu. 1974
Bonded, qu. 1260, qu. 1971, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866
Lumber industry, 1245
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Oil companies, 2505
Oliver, Hon. John, freight rates, 1915, 2505
Correspondence, 1307
Orientals
Business interests of, 1896, 1901-03
Correspondence, 1307
Fishery licenses, 1541. *See also under this title,* Japanese
Immigration, 1217. *See also* Chinese Immigration; Immigration, Oriental
Restriction, 1453
Steveston fishing industry, 1901
Public buildings, 1024
Railway grades, 1917
Resources, 2940
Salmon-canning industry, 1540
Steamship services, 4003
Sumas lake reclamation project, 3431
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2683, 3946
Terms of union, 1916
Trade with Britain via Panama canal, 3053
Unemployment, 1678
Relief, discontinuance of Federal aid, 1658

British Columbia Fisheries Commission 1453, 3372
Salmon-canning licenses, 1540

British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association, licenses, 1541

British Constitution. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

British Dominions, Senates, constitution of, 1370, 1375

British Empire Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

British Empire Settlement Board. *See* Immigration, Empire Settlement

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1391. *See also* Labour, Strikes
Letters from Messrs. McNeil and McLachlan to Prime Minister, 1704
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704

British Goods, importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty. *See* Japan

British Market. *See* British Preference; Grain; Live Stock, Cattle Trade

British National Labour Party. *See* Labour

British North America Act
Amendment of, 2592, 4660
Bankruptcy legislation, 3095
Constitution, control over, 2895
Intercolonial railway and, 1765
International labour conference, 1645
Labour organizations, jurisdiction, 2891, 2892
Readjustment of representation. *See* Redistribution bill
Right to revise, 1378, 3059
Unemployment relief, responsibility, 1680

British Preference, 2734, 2948, 3082. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty
Australia, 1850
British goods free, 3039
Canadian industry penalized, 2957
Cattle embargo and, 3053. *See also this title under* Live Stock
Clothing, 3032
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 1757, 1772, 2645, 2678, 2734, 2898, 2948, 3015, 3039, 3053, 3068, 3082, 3454, 3895
Goods via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454, 3895
Transhipment at port in British colony, 3895

British Preference—*Con.*
Discount of 10 per cent, 2645, 2650
French treaty and. *See that title under* Treaties
Hudson Bay railway and, 2878
Increase, 453, 2243, 2713, 2741, 2832, 2854, 2898, 2907, 2937, 2989, 3034, 3039, 3053, 3454, 3487
Benefit to maritime provinces, 2968
Fifty per cent of general tariff, 2718, 2928, 3039, 3048
Knitting industry, 2958
Petition against, 2958
Woollen industry affected, 2958
Introduction of, 2832, 3009
Liberal policy and, 3007
Limitation to Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Progressive party and, 2776, 2777
Rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809
Sugar, 2651
Ways and Means committee, 3454
Woollen industry, 2989, 3034, 3458

British Shipping Board, loss of Llandovery Castle, 1745

British Subjects, definition. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill

British War Medals. *See* War, Medals

British Wars, participation in. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Near East Crisis

Broadcasting Stations. *See* Radiotelegraphy

Bronze Powder industry. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 47. Inheritance and pride in family traditions, William Lyon Mackenzie, 47; conditions in the West; lake grain rates; cattle embargo, 48; inquiry into grain trade; the British Empire, 49; national obligations, 49-50
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Annuities, advertising, 1642
Breweries and export liquor houses, Licenses, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, 1866
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3691
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 566
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1009
Elevators, overages, 2043

Brown, Mr. J. L.—*Con.*
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Conference, 606
Fishing schooner race, 115
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1934
French treaty bill, 2223
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 194
Health of animals, 576
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway, 3784
Iron ore discovery, Lake Athabaska, 2513
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill (value of citizenship) 2441
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Proportional representation, 402
Public buildings, New Brunswick, 4613
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 716, 743
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3783
School lands, unpaid balances, 1385, 4203
Seed inspection, 196,198
Steamship services, 2172
Toronto seed branch building, 4621, 4623
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Vocational training, 687
Welland canal construction, 3783

Brown, Mr. M. A., Medicine Hat. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Browntail Moth. *See* Insect Pests

Bruce County pioneering conditions, 2870

Brussels Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Bryant's Landing, wharf, 950.

Bryce, Lord, proportional representation, 390

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Alterations in budget of 1922 and results, 2988
Amendment (Mr. Forke) 2717, 2755, 2776, 2787, 2803, 2809, 2817, 2820, 2822, 2837, 2845, 2854, 2861, 2884, 2932, 2944, 2947, 2955, 2966, 2973, 2976, 3010, 3014, 3015, 3023, 3039, 3051, 3073, 3077; neg. on division, 3082
Planks of Liberal platform included in 2861
Balanced, 2986, 3005, 3078. *See also* speeches on Budget
Changes, 3082
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469,
Debate on, 2701, 2741, 2795, 2837, 2898, 2928, 2984, 3046
Precedence, 2694

Budget—*Con.*
Deficits, 2784
Divisions
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com. agreed to, 3084
Finance Minister
Record established by, 2852
Seventeeth budget, 2657, 2852
Speeches, 2701, 3074
Liberal and Conservative, no difference between, 2792
McMaster, Mr., attitude on budget, references, 3013, 3022, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 3055, 4393
Presentation, form of, 2818, 2984, 3001, 3077
Record established by Minister of Finance, 2657, 2852
Resolutions, 2650, 3084, 3229, 3454, 3895, 3963, 4369, 4392, 4408, 4409. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Amended, 3046
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to necessity for M. for Ways and Means, 2640
Speakers in debate: Messrs. Anderson, 2837; Archambault, 2879; Arthurs, 3033; Bancroft, 2736; Bird, 2787; Church, 2817; Denis (St. Denis), 3038; Drayton, Sir Henry, 2657; Drummond, 2973; Evans, 3067; Euler, 2852; Fielding, 2701, 3074; Findlay, 2883; Fontaine, 2814; Forke, 2711, amdt. 2717; neg. on div., 3082; Gould, 2951; Grimmer, 2898; Harris, 2804; Hopkins, 2980; Hudson, 3060; Hughes, 2919; Humphrey, 2940; Kellner, 2809; King, Mackenzie, 3046; King (Huron), 2908; Leader, 3039; Lovett, 2944; Lovie, 2871; Maclaren, 2948; Maclean (Prince), 2967; Maclean (Halifax), 3000; Maclean (York), 3055; McBride, 3031; McKillop, 2981; McMaster, 3012; Manion, 2746; Marler, 3022; Martell, 2904; Meighen, 2984; Morrison, 2928; Motherwell, 2756; Pritchard, 2730; Raymond, 2741; Reed, 2830; Robichaud, 2935; Ross (Kingston), 2832; Ryckman, 2912; Senn, 2957; Sexsmith, 2784; Spence, 2976; Stansell, 3062; Steedsman, 2835; Stewart (Argenteuil), 2795; Stork, 2733; Tolmie, 2861; Ward, 2959; White, 2964; Woods, 2846; Woodsworth, 2718
Statements omitted, 2860, 2926
Inquiry, 2898
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion on, 2771, 2853. 2946

Buffalo
Elk island park, 3435
Lamont park, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 3941, 4702
Tuberculosis, 3439
Wainwright herd, 2773, 3941

Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company. *See* Bridges; Private Bills

Building. *See also* Housing; Labour
Bricklayers' wages, $12 per day, 2165, 3017
Building materials
Brick 3017
Cement, free admission, United States, 3017
Firebrick duty, 3481. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Freight rates, 1961, 3036
French treaty, 1982
Prices, 2164, 3004
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Farm homes, 1178. *See also* Housing
Fuel supply and house construction, 3203
Increase of, 3055
United States, activity in, 3004, 3017. *See also* Emigration to United States
Wages, building trades, 2165, 3017. *See also* Labour, Wages

Building Stone, Hudson bay region, 1073

Building Trades. *See* Labour.

Bukowina. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Bunyan, John, imprisonment, 3157

Burdis, Mr. W. D., salmon canners, 1541

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4101, 4136
Officers and employees, right to organize, 4162
Beckett, Matt C., dismissal, 816
Bonded liquor houses, New Brunswick, 1212
British preference, Canadian ports, 3457
Building trades, 1812
Business of the House
Estimates, method of discussion, 4615-6
Legislation pending, 3265
M. to increase taxation, 3937
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Cadet services, 877, 879
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4306
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canned salmon shipment, Panama canal to Halifax, 2615, 3272

Bureau, Hon. Jacques—*Con.*
Cheque tax, 3926, 3929
Civil service, political partisanship, 286
Customs and Excise
Department, estimates, 3272
Duty on goods from one Canadian port to another, 2615, 3272
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3928
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 3273
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Experimental farms, 471
Hamilton customs house, 3278
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Certificate of analyst) 3749, 3969, 4131, 4207, 4528
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1810
Marking Act, 931
Masters and mates, 2610
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Inspection bill, 3969, 4248, 4276
Pilot boats, 3358
Postage stamps, for revenue purposes, 1815, 3298
Post Office
Postmasters, appointment, 1830
St. Baranabe Nord, Mr. Gelinas, 1830
Superintendent of Mail Contracts, 1814
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4680
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, 3280
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Reciprocity. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4429
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 245, 923
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-4246
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3345, 3374
Special War Revenue Act, M. (Mr. Stevens) 245, 923
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3863, 4207
Toronto
Customs building, 3278, 3282
Viaduct, 4441
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 931, 936

Bureau of Standards, 788

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burke, Edmund
Function of Parliament, 3018
Relation of member to constituent, 3022

Burne, Mr. Joseph, Immigration department, qu. 3141

Burns, Mr. Pat, price of live stock, 1101

Business Depression, 2798. *See* Address; Budget; Immigration

Business of the House. *See* House of Commons

Business Profits Tax. *See* Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, Amdt. Bill (Removal of restrictions as to liability for)
Res. 4440, 4489; 1r., 2r., 4491; com., 3r., 4492

Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act; Dairying Industry

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* Governor General; reference to in address

Cabinet. *See* Government

Cables. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Cabot Strait, ice obstruction, 2614

Cadet Services. *See* National Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Belle River harbour, 4600
Business profits tax, 4490
Canadian exhibition in France, 4711
Canadian Press Limited
Bill, 1464
Subsidy, 4727
Combines bill, 2628
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1133
Empire settlement scheme, 1132
Policy, 1132
Reference to speech on, 1209
St. John immigration building, 1460
Newspaper combine, 4728

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Paternalism, excess of, 1133
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4513
Railways, Canals & Telegraph lines Com., report, 2252
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4490
Rural depopulation, causes of, 1133
Supply, relevancy, 4719
Tariff, immigration and, 1133

Calcium Carbide, free admission to United States, 3017

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Accredited herd system, 577, 582, 585, 626
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Agricultural publications, 598
Agriculture department, salaries, 610
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2048, 2133, 2136
Annual drill, 4637
Audibility of debates, 976
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4115
Bonded warehouses, New Brunswick, 1212
Business of the House
Private members' days, 574
Prorogation, postponement of, 4754
Questions, as orders for returns, 938, 1386
Butter, British market for, 3298
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill 3973
Coasting regulations, 4276
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4311
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4401
Rejection by Senate, 4698
Capital punishment, 768
Civil government estimates, form of, 610
Dairying industry, 609, 1845
Destructive insects and pests, 596
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads), 4365
Duties, revenue loss and smuggling, 3231
Emigration to the United States, 1845
Execution in Carleton county, 778
Exhibitions, 1465
Experimental farms, 484
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4273, 4541
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Fertilizers, duty on, 3486
Fisheries
Fishways in Salmon river, 3362
Pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 819
Fox-breeding industry, 588
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 810
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grand Falls railway, 4311
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of Animals, 582, 586, 3989. *See also under this title,* Accredited herds; Animal contagious diseases
Hector celebration, 4637
Highways, 3188
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business
Acoustics, 1722
Members' rooms, lighting and ventilation, 1728
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Child, 1470
Indians
Tobique reserve, 2154-55
Victoria reserve, roads, 2153
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3231
Intercolonial, employees' pensions, 3196
Interest rate, 4115
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Judges' Act. Amdt. bill, 3265
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
Lake Grain rates bill, 4232
Live stock, 587, 588
Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken) 835
Manitoba Plup and Paper Company, 3256
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 308
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3271
Parliament buildings, 1718
Acoustics, 1721
Reconstruction committee, 1724
Patents of Invention bill, 2077, 3154
Penitentiaries, earnings of inmates, 772
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-3884
Widow who marries after disability appears, amdt. 3882, agreed to, 3884
Pensions, royal commission, 674, 681
Recommendations, 2394
Point of order (Mr. Carroll) 3267
Potatoes
Duty, 2707
Grading, 598
Growing and marketing, 308
Wharfage tolls, 975
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Privilege (Mr. Carroll) 3268, 3270
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Root vegetables bill, 937

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
St. John and Quebec railway
Connection with Eastern Maine railway, 4311
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John river, pollution of, 701, 3362
St. John-Westfield branch line, 4312
Seed inspection, 197
Soldier settlement, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 669
Salaries and contingencies, 669
Soldiers, venereal diseases, 705
Spruce bud worm, 596
Steamship services, 2171
St. John-Digby, 2176
Taxes, unpaid, 3258
Testing dairy cattle, 1307
Vancouver harbour bill, 332
Wharfage tolls, 974

Calgary
Customs examining warehouse, 1023
Post office, 629, 1024
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679, 1683

Calgary Power Company, 3442
Banff national park, power rights, 3750, 3939

Calves, inspection of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Camp Borden. *See* National Defence, Canadian Air Force

Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections; Senate and House of Commons bill

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways

Campbell, Commander, report, St. Andrew's harbour, 2900

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Agricultural conditions, 1402
Agricultural implements, standardizing, 805
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
Bank Act Amdt. bill, interest rate, 4118
Binder twine duty, removal, 4387
Canada-West Indies service, 3379, 3386
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3798
Advance, 3824
Shipping combines, 3845
West Indies service, 3379, 3386

Campbell, Mr. Milton N.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Advance of $73,000,000, 3651
Capitalization and fixed charges, qu. 3323, 3680
Paris offices, 3197
Transcontinental, condition of, 3680
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1406
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Cheque tax, 3934
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads) 3982
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 3240, 4631
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1406
Fort Churchill townsite, qu. 284
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 3194
Fuel supply, 806
Governor General, expenditure, 4628
Grain-growing and freight rates, 3194
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4387
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Land, qu. 283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1070
Immigration
Land settlement, 1406, 1883
Policy, 1402
Soldier settlement board, 1406
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interest rate, 4118
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-34
Land settlement policy, 1406, 1883
National Gallery, 1018
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3983
Northover, Major H. R., claim, 4635
Passports, issuing of, 3988
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4750
Prices, farm and manufactured products, 1403
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Public archives, 3985
Quebec elevator, grain shipment, 4233
Rural depopulation, 1406
Taxation, burden of, 1403
West Ukrainian republic, M. 651, 657
Western provinces, conditions in, 1402
Wheat board, 2857

Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626

Campbellton wharf, 945

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill; Petawawa

Canada Colonization Association. *See this title under* Immigration.

Canada-France Convention of Commerce. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Canada Gazette, 1707

Canada Grain Act. *See* Grain

Canada Highways Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Highways, (Time for earning and receiving payment of grant extended for two years.)
Res. 2253, 2338; 1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2469; 3r., 2470

Canada, Status of, 40, 165. *See also* British North America Act; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties, Halibut treaty

Canada's Claims. *See* Germany, Reparations

Canada's Constitutional Development, 4455-80. *See also* Treaties, Halibut

Canada's Participation in War, 4655. *See also* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis
M. (Mr. Power) 1529

Canada Shipping Act. *See also* Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Announcement of legislation on lake freight rates, 3507. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Certificates to masters and mates; pilotage
Res. 2418; 2668; 1r., 2668; 2r., com., 3r., 3146
2. Distressed seamen; certificate of registration; certificate of inspection
Res. 574, 3969; 1r., 2r., com., 3973; 3r., 4207
3. Restoration of ships purchased from foreign subjects; loading of grain cargoes; port wardens; returns by surveyors
Res. 3749, 3961, 4235; 1r., 4236; 2r., com., 3r., 4276

Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Capitalization, 1391
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 3208
Shipping combine, 4278
Sifton, Sir Clifford, director, 4285
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Traffic, exchange, 2983, 3208

Canada Steamship Lines Limited—*Con.*
War claims, qu. 3142

Canada Temperance Act, 2942. *See also* Liquor
Administration, 2495
Plebiscites under, 2495

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill (Importation into prohibition province prohibited)
Res. 574, 767; 1r., 767; 2r., 2284; com., 2284; 2404, 2419; 3r., 2428; Senate amendments, 4732
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. McQuarrie) 2414-15, neg. 2428
Amdt. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 2419, agreed to, 2428
Blending, 2408, 2419
Brewers, 2404
British Columbia
Administration of law, 2404-13
Correspondence with, 1032, 1307
Exportation, 2404
Government control, 2406
Importation prohibited, 2404, 2419. Exceptions, 2404, 2419
Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney General of British Columbia, 2412
Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C., opinion of, 2408

Canadian Air Force. *See* National Defence

Canadian Ambassador at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

Canadian Athletic Team at Olympic Games, 4706

Canadian Authors Association. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998. *See also* Treaties, French

Canadian Citizenship. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Canadian Council of Agriculture
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Res. respecting, 255

Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307

Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876

Canadian Credit Men's Association. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Canadian Domicile. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Canadian Economic Conference, Sir Charles Gordon, 4023

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Forestry Association, 3409. *See also* Forests and Forestry

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 110, 2172. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Freight Rates; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
- Advances to, 2641, 3830
  - $1,700,000, 3376
  - $1,500,000, 3798, 3824
- Assets and liabilities, 3804
- Atlantic combines, qu. 2613
- Cattle shipments, 2758, 2807, 3040, 3811
- Coal cargoes, 3807, 3814, 3826
- Committee, 2474
- Construction, 3780
  - Cost per ton, 957
  - Without tender and contract, 957
- Deficit, 2928, 3006, 3038, 3072, 3377, 3798, 3802, 3843
- Directors, 3811
- Expenditure, 3802
  - Earnings and, 1868
- Flour, discrimination against Canadian, 2761
- Freight rates, regulation of, 3806
- Grain trade, 2828, 3263, 3812, 4234
- Insurance, 1568
- Lake grain-carrying trade, 3776, 4223, 4284. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates bill
- Lease of freighters to Great Lakes Transportation Company, 3848
- Loan to, 113-114. *See also* under this title, Advances
- Management, 3637
- Mediterranean service, qu. 1488, 1636
- Milburn, Mr. H., qu. 1138
- Negotiations for sale of 27 ships, 1975. *See also under this title,* Vessels, sale of
- New York pool, 3806
- North Atlantic Conference, 2127, 2761
- Ocean rates, 2760
- Policy, 3798, 3827, 3830
  - Unemployment, 3828, 3846
- Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, 4708
- Public ownership, 3798
- Return cargoes, absence of, 2928
- St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, service on, qu. 2613
- Sailings, qu. 4511
  - Arrangements for 1924, qu. 4751
- Scrap metal and material, qu. 1138
- Shipping combines, 1395, 2127, 2760, 3848, 4223
- Ships, sale of. *See under this title,* Vessels
- Subsidized steamship services, competition, 3378
- Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
- Thornton, Sir Henry, 3811
  - Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
  - Utilization of boats for cattle, 3040
  - West Indies service, 3379
- Trade with Fiji Islands, 1848
- Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
- Transportation combine. *See under this title* Shipping Combines
- Vessels
  - Earnings, etc., 3324, 3399
  - Laid up, 3379, 3386
  - Sale of, 1975, 2518, qu. 2613, 2828, 3385-6, 3705, 3813, 3822, 3846
- Vote under closure 4598
- West Indies and South American trade, 3378, 3808, 3835, 3840

Canadian Government Railways. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Canadian Magazines, Encouragement of. *See* Magazines

Canadian Manufacturers Association. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
- Bankruptcy, 3093
- Canada Colonization Association, disbursements to, 1164, 1171
- Canadian Trade Index, 2217
- Copyright, 2142, 2289
- French treaty, 1997, 2001, 2209, 2229
- Greater production campaign, 2725
- Shaw, Mr. J. B., fuel policy, 1265
- Trade Mark and Designs Act bill, 2293

Canadian National Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 693

Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites, 3406, 3432. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Administration, 66
Automobiles, admission fee, 3942
Banff National park
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electrical equipment, 3434, 3949
Springs and cave, 496
Waterpowers, 496, 3420, 3750
Power rights, Calgary Power Company, 3750, 3442, 3939
Buffalo in. *See* Buffalo
Commissioner, location in Western Canada, 3436
Elk Island buffalo park, 3435
Expenditure, 3941
Further amount, 4702
Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406, 3432, 3435
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Historic sites commission, 3406
Golf course, Jasper park, 3435
Minette Hot springs, 3949
Moose mountains pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal government in, 3436
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Nova Scotia historical society, 3406
Quebec battlefields commission, 3406, 3432
Playgrounds, 3432
Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Preservation of, 3249
Roads and bridges, 1014
Supplementary vote, 3948
Timber wolves, destruction by, 597
Tourist traffic, 3435
Revenue, 3942
Wainwright, slaughter of buffalo, 4702
Waterton lakes park, 3435

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways and Canals;
Accounting, 4328. *See also* Board of Audit
Unification of, 3196
Acquisition, history of, 55
Advances, 2641
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650, 3676
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681, neg. 3701
Statement of appropriations, 1922-23, 1923-4, 3789
Additional
$1,550,000, 4692
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 1764, 3376
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 56, 61, 2471

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Amalgamation—*Con.*
Causes of delay, 56
Economies resulting from, 1616
Orders in council effecting, 34, 53, 3620
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Appointments, 2472
Balfour, Col. H. N., reported, 2794, 2828
From outside Canada, 2827
Promotion, principle of, 3621
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported, 2794, 2828
Appropriations, statement of, 2898, 2926, 3789
Atlantic division, boundaries, qu. 1363, 1754-62, 1770-72
Atlantic ports, 1754. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports; Terminals
Audit staff, Moncton, removal, 574, 1756
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Betterments, 1562
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors.
Board of management. *See under this title,* Directors; Management
Branch lines, 1568, 3626, 4688. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bills
Advances, 4329
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain, 4189, 4197
Bruederheim, 4199, 4316
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie, 4699
Construction of, 1185, 3625
Cost per mile, 4327
Dunblane-Aylesbury, 4308, 4333
Dunlane-Mawer line, 4201
Eston branch, 4201
Expenditure
Appropriations, 4303, 4329, 4337
Authorization by Parliament, 4515
Financing, 4304, 4319, 4329
Grand Falls, 4310
Grande Fresniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312, 4326
Grande Prairie, 1185, 4200
Halifax-Musquodobit, 4317
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 4321
Hanna-Warden-Loverna, 4308, 4322, qu. 4436
Inverness railway, 4198
Inverness and Richmond, 4324
Kamloops-Okanagan, 4314
Kent Northern, 4189, 4197
Lockeport railway, 4326
Long Lac-Nakina, 3224, 4194, 4310, 4326
Meductic-International boundary, 4309, 4311
Melfort, 4319
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls, 4189, 4197

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Branch lines—*Con.*
Okanagan, 4314
Oliver-St. Paul, 4323
Paddockwood, 4319
Peace River, 4324
Peebles-Lampman, 4325
Prince George to Peace River, construction, 1434, 4701
Purchase of, 3646
St. John and Quebec, 4305
St. John and Westfield, 4312
St. Peter's-Louisburg, 4319, 4324
Sunny Brae-Guysborough, 4316, 4320, 4321
Thunderhill, 4311, 4315, 4322
Waterous-Swift Current, 4308
Windsor-Chester, 4333
Yorktown-Willowbrook, 4308
British mails, delay in, 2695
British preference and, 3053
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business cars, 489, 4527
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Exchange of traffic, 2983, 3208
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian government railways
Advances, 1565
Audit office, transfer, Moncton to Montreal, 574, 1756
Deficit, 1560
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Canadian National Safety League, 3956
Canadian National telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Canadian Northern, 1760. *See also under this title,* Annual Statement of Minister
Acquisition of, 56-57, 1937
Advances, 1565
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Amalgamation, causes of delay, 56-58
Arbitration, 56
British Columbia guarantee, 1946
Embezzlement of funds, 381
Fixed charges, 1565, qu. 3323
Gratuities to directors and officials, disclosure of, 2962
Insurance, 1568
Manitoba, agreement with, 1932, 1939
Securities, 1564
System, 55-56
Canadian Northern Express Company. *See under this title,* Express

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian ports, 3454. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports, Terminals
Capital expenditure, control of, 2827
Capitalization, 3192
Fixed charges and, qu. 3323
Reduction of, 3058
Car shortage, 62
Champlain market station, 4446
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760-1770
Coal. *See also that title*
Freight rates on, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Purchases, 1277, 1561, qu. 4303, 4708, qu. 4752
Alberta coal, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Maccan and river Hébert, mines, 1027
United States, in, 1277, 3493, qu. 4511
Transportation, 1264
Commitments, 18-19
Committee on, 2473
Construction, new, 1562, 1922
Co-ordination, 18, 28, 34, 53, 56, 61, 1616, 2471, 3620
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Cost of taking over, 92
Courtesy, 2859, 2971
Debt, 2802
Deficits, 1613, 2658, 2802, 2827, 2831, 3006, 3024, 3038, 3078, 3610, 3620, 3651, 4190. *See also* speeches on Budget; Supply
Taxation and, 3006
Directors, 36, 60, 62, qu. 1973, 2833
Additional, for Quebec, 34. *See also this head,* Talbot
Address and occupation, qu. 1973
British Columbia appointment, 373
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3811
Cattle shipments, 2758
Dawson, Mr. F. G., 373, qu. 1973
Gratuities to, 1687, 2962
Inspection trip, qu. 489
Labour, representation of, 1652, 1656, 3636
M. (Mr. Lapointe) 1653-56
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1654
New board of, 13
New Brunswick representation, qu. 282
Private cars, qu. 489
Removal of late board, correspondence, 3962
Responsibilities and powers, 2478, 3610, 3653. *See also under this title,* Management
Retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Sinclair, Mr. John A. statement, qu. 1363

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Directors—*Con.*
Special train, qu. 489
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258, 2004
Doctors, qu. 814
Dominion Express Company. *See also under this title,* Express
Dorchester employees, qu. 2086
Earnings, 3620, 3651
Eastern division
Brown, Mr. L. S., superintendent, 2971
Improved situation, 2971
Moncton headquarters, 2971
Eastern Land Company, purchase of land at Capreol, 626, 1635
Efficiency, 2859
Electric lines, sale of to municipalities, 2475. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203, 3422, 3425
Employees, 55, 3621
Pensions, 14, 288. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Equipment, 1561, 4692
Orders, 2701
Estimates, 1566, 1619, 1764
Expenditure, 2987, 3078, 3620, 4305
Authorization by Parliament, 3615-40, 4304, 4397, 4515
Express. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Canadian Express Company, 2470
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Canadian Northern Express, 2470
Dominion Express Company, termination of contract with, 2473
Intercolonial Express Company, 2470
Rates, 2876
Fish, on, 3365
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Finance
Advances by government, 1565
Consolidated income figures, 1564
Financial statement, inquiry, 666
Financing in 1922, 1564
Securities, approval of, 4402. *See also under this title,* Securities
Fixed charges, qu. 708, qu. 814, 1565
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633
Fredericton bridge, 3645, 4310
Freight cars, 4692
Interchange with United States, 4697
Purchase of in United States, 4692
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Coal, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
General conditions, 1559
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Grades, 1965
British Columbia, 1917
Grain shipments, qu. 1484. *See also* Grain
Canadian and United States ports, 1756
Diversion to American ports, 2899
Portland, 1756
St. John, 1768
Grand Trunk, 1562
Additions and betterments, 1564
Advances, 1565
Amalgamation, delay in, 18, 56
Arbitration, 59, 1154, 1307
Arbitrators, fees, etc., qu. 624, qu. 1257
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029, qu. 1661, 2813
Assets, disposal of, 1665
Atwater, Mr. A. R., gratuity, qu. 1632
Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C., gratuity, qu. 1632
Central Vermont
Deficits, 1563
Operating results, 1613
Transportation Company, 1564
Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company, 1563
Coal purchases, 1564
Commitments, qu. 206, qu. 207
Crowsnest pass agreement, rates, 1563
Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deer, Mr. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deficits, 1563
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203
Elevator, Montreal, qu. 1974
Equipment, all lines, 1564
Galloway, Mr. D. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Grades, 1965
Gratuities to retiring directors and officials, 1664-68
British board of directors, qu. 1632
Disclosure of, 2962
Payments out of insurance, 1632, 1665
Progressive party and, 1687
Refund, 1667
Royal commission, 1665
Congdon, Mr. F. T., appointment, 2297, 2710, qu. 3131
Order in Council, tabled, 2347
Inquiry, 1976, 2297
Income account, 1563
Insurance, 1568
Insurance fund, payment of gratuities out of, 1632, 1665
International bridge company, 1563

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Grand Trunk—*Con.*
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Logan, Mr. R. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Management, personnel, 1612. *See also under this title,* Directors; Management
Martin, Mr. H. G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Montreal and Southern Counties Railway, 1564
Montreal Warehousing Company, 1564
Norman, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Ocean ports, 1758. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Providence, 1755, 1762
Operating results, 1560-3
Oshawa Railway, Rail and River Coal Company, 1564
Pensioners, annual passes, qu. 2418
Pension rights of employees, 14
Preference and common shareholders, representations, 3960
President, retiring allowance, 2785
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664
Profit and loss, qu. 1257
Pullen, Mr., 2472
Purchase price, qu. 1257
Robb, Mr. W. D., gratuity, qu. 1632
Rosevear, Mr. J. M., gratuity, qu. 1632
Scott, Mr. Frank, gratuity, qu. 1632
Separately-owned companies, 1563
Shareholders, list of, 939
Stock, 61
Terminal Warehousing Company, 1564
Terminals in United States, 815
Portland, 1755, 1758, 1768, 2898
Providence, 1755, 1762
Thousand Island railway, 1564
Ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Traffic, 1563
Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59, 152, 1761
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Bell, Mr. G. T., gratuity, qu. 1632
Construction, cost of, 1918
Debenture holders, representation, 3507, 3581
Fixed charges, 1565
Hansard, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Hinton, Mr. W. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Loan of $15,000,000, 2920
Porter, Mr. S. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Gratuities. *See under this title,* Grand Trunk
Refund of, 1667
"Greatest railway in the world," 3056
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Halifax terminals, qu. 4518. *See also under this title* Terminals

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1612, 2050
Director, Canadian Steamship Lines, 3208
Retirement, 1666
Gratuity, qu. 1632
Hayes, Mr. 2471
Headquarters, 62, 3224. *See also under this title,* Moncton
Divisional, 63
Montreal, 1757
Hotel Scribe. *See under this title,* Paris Offices
Hotels, 938, qu. 1257
Deficits, 2976
Manager, qu. 1257
Hudson Bay railway and. *See that title*
Immigration, 1121
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Conference, 1193
Income account, 1559
Inquiry into, 19
Insurance, 1567, 1616. *See also* Canadian National Railways bill, Insurance
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Mitchell, Mr. A. J., interests in, 2050
Mortgaged premises. *See this title under* Canadian National Railway bills
Rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 135, 1756, 1760, 1765
Atlantic ports, 1754-62
British North America Act and, 1765
Express. *See under this title,* Express
Moncton headquarters, 13
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Pensioners, annual pass, qu. 2418
Pensions, 3195
Kelley, Mr. Howard, 1612, qu. 1632
Labour, representation, 1561. *See under this title, also,* Directors; Moore
Land
Contiguous to, 1880
Purchases or sales, 1739
Legislation, qu. 4300. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Management, 1616, 2832, 3041, 3623. *See also under this title,* Directors
Details of, 2472
Liberal resolution of 1921, 3685, 3688
Non-interference with, 2473, 3670
Personnel, 3058
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3620, 3623, 3653, 3811. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices; Thornton
Capital investments. *See under this*

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
title, Paris Offices
Maritime provinces in, 126-130
Maritime region, 1754, 1757
Mileage, 55, 1765, 3197
Cost, and, 914
Operated, 1558
Traffic and, comparison, 2949
Minister, acting, statement by, 55-63
Minister's annual statement, 1558; operated mileage, 1558; general conditions, 1559; income account, 1559; net operating deficit, 1560; decreased operating expenses, 1560; operating ratio, 1560; traffic results, steam lines, 1561; operating expenses, 1561; labour, 1561; locomotive coal purchases, 1561; equipment, 1561; betterments, 1562; new construction, 1922, 1562; Grand Trunk, 1562; income account, 1563; Grand Trunk traffic, 1563; separately-owned companies, 1563; employees and compensation, 1564; equipment, Grand Trunk, all lines, 1564; coal, 1564; additions and betterments, 1564; finance; consolidated income figures, 1564; financing in 1922, 1564; advances by government, 1565; fixed charges, 1565; estimates, 1566; reorganization, Sir Henry Thornton, 1566; insurance, 1567; tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Mitchell, Mr. A. J.,
Insurance, interest in, 2050
Petiring gratuity, qu. 1632, 1667
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Montford railway, 4199
Moore, Mr. Tom
Labour representative, directors, 1652, 1654, 3636
Statement on immigration, 1167
Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257
National Transcontinental. *See under this title,* Transcontinental
Net operating deficits, 1560
New positions and salaries, 2701
Niagara and St. Catharines railway, 2475
Niagara Central railway, 2480
No politics order, 3623
Ocean ports and terminals, 1754, 1757-1762, 1767, 1768, 2898, 2899, 2937, 3454. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Official cars, 3621
Officials, retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Operation
Costs, 1919
Deficits, 3701
Expenses, decreased, 1560, 1561

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Ratio, 1560
Orders in council, 815
Over-capitalization, 2860
Ownership, 3192, 3224
Page, Supt., alleged statement, 4514
Paris offices, purchase of Hotel Scribe, 3197, 3208, 3224, 3279, 3610, 3610-46, 3650-76, 3676-3708, 3811, 3813, 3838, 4514
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 3664, ruled out of order, 3667
Aronovici, Mr. A., 3612, 3652
Peace river
Branch lines, 1434, 4324, 4701
Survey, 4898
Policy, 1764, 3620
Pre-audit, 3701
Preferential treatment of localities, 1762
President, appointment of, 2827
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Prince Rupert, 2734
Printing, 1623
Contracts, 3144
Winnipeg, qu. 3323
Private cars, 489, 4527
Property, purchases and sales, 1739, 2518, 3324
Prospects of success, 2830
Providence, Rhode Island, building, 1755
Public ownership, 1614, 1618, 1770, 2859, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Quebec terminals, 446
Railway Commission and, 666
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rates. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Real estate, 1739, 2518, 3324
Regional areas, 135, 3621
Regulations, 496
Reorganization, Thornton, Sir Henry, 1566
Report, 3223
Retirement fund, 1667
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1483. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Revaluation, 2859
Earning power, 2860
Replacement, 2860
Revenue, detailed, 2898
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Robb, Mr., qu. 1632, 2471
Rolling stock and equipment, 61, 1561, 3962
St. Croix, 2899
St. John and Quebec railway, 3403
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John terminal, 3645. *See also* St. John, *and under this title,* Terminals
St. Malo repair shops, 4447

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Scarfe Varnish Works, purchases, qu. 1485
Service, improved, 2859, 3041
Settlement along, 1185
Shannon, Mr. L. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Combine, 2127
Steel, lifting of, 1664
Strategic advantages, 3057
Superannuation fund, qu. 2418
Tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore. *See under this title,* Directors
Teakle, Mr. R. B. letter as to cattle shipments, 2758
Telegraph service, Canadian Press, 4728
Terminals. *See also under this title* Ocean ports
Atlantic division, qu. 1363, 1771
Halifax, 1756, 1759, 1768, 4713, qu. 4751
Maritime region, qu. 1662
Ocean. *See also under this title,* Ocean
Winter ports, 2902
Portland, Maine, 1755, 1768
Providence, 1755, 1762
St. John, 1756, 1759, 1768
Thornton, Sir Henry, 13, 52, 1566, 1612, 2833. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices
Appointment, 2828
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Assistants, reported appointment of Messrs. Balfour and Thomas, 2794, 2828
Atlantic division, 1771
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Cattle shipments, 2758
Coal transportation, 1264
Criticism of, 3640
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1966
Financial statement, 666
Freight rates on Alberta coal, 1268
Immigration, 1167, 2795, 2840
Maritime boards of trade, conference, 1755, 1771
Ocean ports, 1758-69
Operating costs, 1919
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3615, 3653
Radial railways, sale of, 2476
Rate discrimination, 1914
Sale of 27 ships, 2828
Speeches, 3637
Ties, purchase of, qu. 516
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4447
Connection between lines, 3224

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Toronto—*Con.*
Level crossings, 2477
Office building, qu. 814, qu. 1663, 2481
King and Yonge Streets property, qu. 1994, 2518, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 517, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442
Toronto Eastern railway, 2475
Toronto Suburban railway, 2181, 2475
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Traffic, 3041
Results, steam lines, 1561
Staff, removal from Truro to Halifax, 4708
Train to carry troops to Sydney, qu. 624
Transcontinental, 1760
Branch line to Montreal, qu. 2393
Cattle shipments, 2807
Development of northern Ontario and Quebec, 2833
Fortin & Moffat claim, 3646
Freight rates, 3680
Operating results, 1560
Strategic advantages, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix projected route, 2898
Transportation combine, 1395. *See also* Freight rates
Truro subway, 4454
Unification of system, 1615, 1666, 3196, 3223
Union stockyards, 2762
United States
Lines, 3197
Terminals, 1755, 1762, 1768
Value of property, 55
Wages, reduction, qu. 1363. *See also* Labour
Waterways, 3057

Canadian National Railways Bills
1. Insurance of mortgaged premises
Res. 1635, 2048; 1r., 2050; 2r., com., 2105; 3r., 2107
2. Express business and sale of electric lines; radial railways
1r., 2392; 2r., com., 2470; 3r., 2481
3. Construction of branch lines
Res. 3961, 4185; 1r., 4201; 2r., 4303-4308; com., 4308; 3r., on div. 4397, 4401
Sections and subjects discussed:
Advances for government railway lines, 4329
Advances pending issue of guaranteed securities, 4344
Amdts. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Guarantee of securities of other lines up to $40,000 per mile, 4339
Lines connecting with Canadian government railways and constructed by company, 4327

Canadian National Railways Bills—*Con.*
Construction of branch lines—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Nature and form of securities, 4339
Power to construct described in schedule, 4308
Rejection by Senate, 4753, 4688, 4689, 4694, 4695
4. Securities, approval of
Res, 4012, 4402; lr., 4405; 2r., com., 4515; m. for 3r., amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to refer back neg., 4732; 3r., 4732
Senate amendments, 4754
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4527, neg. 4528
Form, term and amount of securities to be approved, 4515

Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953

Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Assets, obligations, etc., qu. 625
Attitude towards Canadian National Railways, 3056
Banff hotel, 3435
British Columbia, qu. 626, 1916
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 3400
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Pacific "party", 3056
Cattle shipments, 3043
Chinese sailors, 2334
Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company, 3235
Construction, 1880, 1916, 1918
Crowsnest pass agreemet, 1620. *See also that title.*
Dividends, 1203, 1392, 1406, 3190
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Earnings, 1919
Net, 1130
Surplus, 1130
Efficient service, 127
Express charges, 2876
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Freight Rates. *See also that title*
Copper bounty and, 3239
Dividends, and, 1134
Ocean, 2127

Canadian Pacific Railway—*Con.*
Grades, 1965
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Conference, 1193
Russia, 1340
Labour, shopmen, resolution of, 1338
Land, 3704
Sale contracts, revision of, 2930
Lanigan, Mr., freight rates, 1918
Operation, cost of, 1918
Quebec terminals, 815
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1458
Shares, transfer under Treaty of Versailles, 2496
Steamship lines, British mails, 2695
Telegraph service, Canadian press, 4728
Toronto, level crossings, 2477
Union stockyards, 2762

Canadian Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Ports; Treaties, French and Italian

Canadian Press Limited. *See Press*

Canadian Representation in the United States, 65, 2735, 3016, 3085, 4001, 4664. *See also* Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Delay, 3085

Canadian Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Canadian Trade Index, 2217

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Wheat Board

Canadians
Distressed, relief of, 1456
Emigrating. *See* Emigration
Repatriation of. *See* Immigration

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence Waterway
Canadian National railways, and, 3057
Cornwall, employees, political partisanship, qu. 3135
Freight rates, water transportation, 1914
Georgian Bay construction, 2816
Grain shipments and, 2808. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Lake Grain Rates
Improvement of, 1619
Isle Perrot bridge, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Panama. *See that title*
Rideau
Improvements, 4691
Water powers, qu. 622

Canals—*Con.*
St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Trent
Bridges, qu. 205
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Expenditure, qu. 4301
Improvements, 3647, 4691
Traffic, qu. 4301
Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Welland
Construction, 3760
Contracts, qu. 1489
Deepening, 2979
Expenditure, 3073, qu. 3820
Inquiry into, 3006
Request for, 3073, 3766, 3772, 3773
Grain shipments, 2808
Grenville by-election, 4606
Hudson Bay railway, 1054, 1068, *See also that title*
Importations of lumber for, qu. 1867
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Towing, qu. 4132

Canned Goods and Fish, freight rates, 1915

Canned Meats Act, inspection, 2202

Canning Licenses. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3090-3105
Business of the House, closure, 3668
Business profits and income taxes, qu. 1157
Canadian National railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3623
Dorchester county employees, qu. 2086
Management, 3623
Details of, Liberal res. of 1921, 3685
Responsibility and powers, 3623, 3684
Paris offices, 3684
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), ruling, 3667
Civil Service
Dismissals after 1911 election, 3347
Quebec city and district, 387
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern, 1933
Grondines wharf, 964
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 981
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3560
Point of order, letter reflecting on House, 4060
Portage la Prairie sewage system, 996
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 754
St. John immigration building, 1461
Toronto Harbour improvements, 985
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Votes of parliament and pledges, 3536

Canso, N. S. wharf, 941

Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 950

Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 1763, 2469

Cape Breton Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Capital. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance
Attraction of, 2802, 3050
Basic industries, and, 3239
Canadian National railways, ownership of, 3192, 3224
Capital levy to pay war debt, 2728, 2743, 2909
Capitalistic system
Control of educational agencies, 2725
Defence of, 2743
Failure of, 2722
Government, influence over, 2726
Labour organization and, 2895
Political parties and, 2810
Capitalists, position of, 2583
Carvell, Hon. F. B., and, 3191
Centralization of, 4047
Control of interlocking directorates, 4026
Definition of, 3068
Diverted by income tax to tax-free bonds, 2914
Domination of, 4026
Farmers, 4045. *See also that title*
Investment in production, 2720
Investment, knowledge as to conditions, 2966
Natural resources, development of, 3027
Rights of, Abraham Lincoln on, 2967
Tariff and, 3025
Taxation of, 2801, 2879, 3010

Capital and Labour. *See also* Labour
Royal commission on industrial relations, report, 2890

Capital Investment, power to make. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris Offices

Capital Punishment
Abolition of, 487. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carleton county execution, 768

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, qu. 204, 1258, 2938, 2939

Carbonic Acid Gas. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Carleton Point, Que., lightkeeper, qu. 285

Carleton County, N.B., execution in, 768

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Annual training, 868
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 255, 4110
Butter factories in new districts, 3284
Canadian National parks, automobile admission fee, 3942
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4201
Cheque tax, 3932
Divorces granted, qu. 622
Dominion Lands Act, school lands, 4202
Eston branch railway, 4201
Grain Commission, salaries, 787
Indians, 2153
Interest rates, 4110
Military hospitals, 672
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2123
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 699
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2113
Penitentiaries, 770
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 735
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
School lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4202
Seed grain advances, 3444
Vancouver harbour bill, 260

Carnegie, Colonel, 1648

Carney, Stephen P., conviction, qu. 3582

Caron, Mr. E., postmaster, Tadoussac, qu. 3139

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Address in reply, 80; unemployment decrease; anti-combine legislation, 80; immigration, desirable types; United Farmers of Alberta and immigration 81; prosperity of western farmers; Soldier Settlement board as an aid to immigration, 82; amendments; Vancouver harbour expenditure, 83; coal resources of Canada, 83-84; strikes, 84; the farmers and larger markets; question of tariff reduction, 85
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3088-3121
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie railway, 4700
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Chinese immigration bill, 4537
"Merchants" definition of, 2483
Civil Service appointments, postmasters, 377
Coal
Eastern and Western Canada, 3204
Freight rates, 3204
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4231
Cold storage warehouses, 189
Combines bill, 2529, 2626

Carroll, Mr. William F.—*Con.*
Dairy Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Notice of M. for 2r., 3402
Renovated butter, 4262
Estimates, method of discussion, 4616
Fuel supply, 3203. *See under this title,* Mines and Minerals
M. (Mr. Church)
Amdt. proposing reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Grain shipments, 4230
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs., detention at border, 3157
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2428
Record of immigrants, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4643
Inverness-Richmond railway, extension, 4324
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Mines and Minerals Committee
First report, 1384
Third report, 4436, 4592, 4743
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2462
Repatriation, M. 1379
Oleomargarine, 4263
Committee on Agriculture, discussion, 3266
M. to permit manufacture, importation and sale, 1382, 3399, 3508, 3573
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3327
Peace river railway, 4324, 4700
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3850-3881, 4747
Pensions
Appeal board, Ottawa, 3731
Royal commission on, opportunity for discussion of report, 674
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128
Privilege, Com. on Agriculture, 3266
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Railway Commission, criticism of judgment, 1916
Registration of ships, 3973
Renovated butter, 4262
St. Peter's Louisburg railway, 4324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Taxation, 2837
Wheat board, Manitoba legislature, 2836

Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See* Labour, International Labour Conference

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Eastern Lands Development Company, 1635
Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Cartwright, Right Hon. Sir Richard, on protection, 3070

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4189
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102, 4509
Bankruptcy Act
Amdt. or abrogation, M., 1490, 1528
Repeal of, 1158
Business of the House
Audibility, 4594
Private members' day, 1158
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4189
Chairman, ruling:
Comittee report not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Combines bill, 2549, 2618, 2627
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4189
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) point of order, 3570
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Senate and House of Commons, bill, 4244

Cattle. *See this title,* under Live Stock

Cattle Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases, Live Stock, Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo. *See* Live Stock

Caucus, Party. *See* Lack of Confidence

Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031

Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture, adjournment, 1685

Cedar Rapids power, Aluminium Company of America, 659
Cement, French Treaty, 1984

Central Research Institute, 788

Census. *See* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics

Central Supply Association, decision, 2593

Chair, Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker

Champlain Dock. *See* Quebec (port)

Champoux, Mr. J. E., Sorel postmaster, qu. 1487

Chanak Affair. *See* Near East Crisis

Chapel Cove, N.S., breakwater, 941

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Apple-grading, 194
Artificial silk, duty, 3489, 3491
Atlanta exhibition, 1465
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and, 1171
Canadian National railways
Express and electric lines bill, 2480
Grand Trunk, gratuities, 1667
Toronto office building, 2481
Civil government estimates, form of, 611
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054, 2060
Cold storage companies, 186
Experimental farms, 480
Firebrick, duty, 3481
French treaty, 453, 1977, 1995
Analysis of, 1978
Bronze powder, 1979, 2217
Customs index, 2269-70
Butter, 2273
Cobalt products, 2263
Cotton, 2263
Silks, 448
Wines, 442
Government elevators, 2036
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu., 813
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 945
Nova Scotia, 4566
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 968
Highway, Canboro-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Contributions of Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1164, 1171
Policy, 1171
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty bill, 2401
Labour department
Staff, 1672, 1678, 1699, 1701
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Technical education, director of, 1674
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Little Anse breakwater, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4573
Macdonald, Sir John A., reciprocity, 2922
Maritime provinces, dredging, 4569
Military properties, maintenance, 889
National defence
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 884, 1741, 1744
Estimates, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 902
Niagara Central railway, 2480
Patents of Invention bill, 2073

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, 774
Point of order, Mr. Caldwell, 3267
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, 1710
Quebec
Arsenal, 884, 1741, 1744
Wharves, 978
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Seed grain advances, 3446
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269
Wedge, Mr. George, qu. 2697

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlottetown public building, 4614

Charlottetown-Pictou steamship service, 2171

Chartered Accountants Association of Canada. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Bank. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Immigrants
Overcharging at Quebec, 3324
Supplies, 496
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1993
Scarfe Varnish works, qu. 1485

Chateau Laurier. *See* Canadian National Railways, Hotels

Chatham, Ont., wharf, 982

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemical Industries, Canadian Society, 2069

Chemicals
Freight rates, 1920
French treaty, 1985

Cheque Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 362, 546, 554, 556
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal of, qu. 4512
Ottawa government workshops, 4619

Chicago
Chicago Drainage Canal, 2993
Diversion of water, qu. 3821
Exhibition, 1454, 1466

Chicago—*Con.*
Fat Stock Show, 1398

Chicoutimi wharf, 950

Chicoutimi-Saguenay county
Postmasters, qu. 3138
Telegraph lines, qu., 3138
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, qu. 3148

Chidley, Cape. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Chief Electoral Officer, salaries and contingencies, 4001

Children
Chinese, born in Canada. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Deaths through fuel shortage, 751, 1657
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Income tax exemptions for, 1382, 2128, 3038, 4502
Mortality of, 1179
Oleomargarine, effect on health. *See* Oleomargarine
Playgrounds, 3407, 3432

Chili, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Chimes. *See* Parliament Buildings, Tower

Chimney Corner, N.S., wharf, 941

China
Bandits in, 2932
Butter shipments to, 1840, 1853
Canadian trade commissioner, 1840
Cheese shipments to, 1853
Chinese Consul General, immigration 1488
Civilization of, 2486
Conditions in, 2316
Immigration from. *See* Chinese Immigration; Immigration
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in, 2695, 2795
Political disturbances, 2325
Trade relations with, 2313, 2316, 2320

Chinese Immigration. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Bill (Entry limited to diplomatic corps; Chinese children born in Canada; merchants and students) 1r., 768; 2r., com., 2308, com., 2481; 3r., 2489; Senate amendments, 4536
Sections and subjects discussed:
Admission for specified period, 2329
Agreement with China, 2317
Appeal to Minister, 2331
Arrest and deportation, 2334
Canadian officers in China, 2308
Chief controller, Department of Immigration, 2308, 2482

Chinese Immigration Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Chinese
Children, 2484
En route, admission, 2488
Landing in violation of act, 2336
Not to leave ship without permit, 2333
Sailors on Canadian vessels, 2334
To register within 12 months, 2333
Women, 2310, 2318, 2484
Representations from British Columbia, 2310
Conductor to furnish list of Chinese persons carried, 2333
Definition, 2308
Deportation, 2488
Entry and landing, 2309
Vancouver and Victoria only, 2327
Evasions, 2315, 2324
Exclusion, 2324, 2482
Head tax, 2312
Identification and registration: certificates, 2331
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Jurisdiction of courts, 2337
Labourers, 2310, 2316
Liability of transportation companies, 2334
Merchants
Definition of, 2317, 2319, 2487
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2320
Students and, 2310
Evasions, 2324
Wives, 2318
Nationality, 2309
Number carried on ship limited, 2333
Offences and penalties, 2488
Officer in China, 2322
Officers in other countries, 2308, 2482
Organizing, unlawful courts, 2337
Passports, 2325
Powers of Governor in council, 2308
Prohibited classes, 2327
Re-entry, 2333
Registered person, 2488
Status, substantiation of, 2487
Students, 2310, 2316, 2324
Violation of act or fraud, 2488
Violation of act, order or regulation, 2337
Wives, 2484. *See also under this title,* Chinese, Women; Merchants

Chisby, Captain, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Eastern harbour improvements, 4569
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743

Chisholm, Hon. C. P. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Abbott's harbour, breakwater, 4563
Address, legislation referred to, in, qu. 2612
Agricultural Conditions, report, qu. 2612
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4068
Banking and Commerce Com. report, qu. 2612
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 703, 4439
Basic industries, assistance, 2822, 3238
Best, Mr. C. H., recognition of, 703
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Board of Commerce, 2583
Budget, 2817; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2817; delay in bringing down budget; tariff not political but economic question; Liberal-Conservative party always protectionist; National policy made Canada great, 2818; protection budget introduced by Minister of Finance; home market; Ontario farmers and protection; Progressive party plank; amendment; industrial conditions preceding adoption of protective policy; tariff stability; Baldwin tinplate industry; loss of due to tariff uncertainty, 2819; government, change of policy; tariff proposals high protection; amendment, Mr. Forke; national policy should be brought up to date; conservation of industries and markets; free trade in potatoes; prices, 2820; eggs, importation from United States; butter; western provinces, conditions in, 2821; houses for harvesters; tendency from free trade and towards protection; industrial conditions in Great Britain; strikes of agricultural labourers; adequate protection of basic industries; unemployment; emigration to United States; industrial possibilities, 2822; wool-combing; hemp industry; skilled workmen going to United States; tariff not responsible for exodus; climate and high taxation; causes of depression; world conditions; high taxation and prices; United States not free trade country; Fordney-McCumber tariff; thirty-five per cent duty on wheat; economy, preaching and practising; deficit in Canada, surplus in Great Britain, France and United States, 2823; Drury government and economy plank; United Farmers of

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Ontario; Ontario, increase of expenditure and debt; British budget, reduction in taxation and expenditure; taxation, increase in Canada, reduction in Great Britain and United States; taxation of luxuries and necessities; "free breakfast table;" coal and food prices; postal rates, reduction of, 2824; public debt; inheritance and income tax; income tax, federal and municipal; cigarette duty; sugar duty, 2825; receipt tax; evasion of; cheque tax; provincial amusement tax, 2826; copper bounty; hemp bounty; wool-combing industry; old age pensions; public health; mother's pensions; railway deficit; Canadian National Railways; capital expenditure; President, appointment of; Col. H. N. Balfour and Mr. A. J. Thomas, appointment of, 2827; principle of promotion; Sir Henry Thornton; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of ships; shipping combine; rates; grain-carrying trade; export tax on pulpwood; water powers, export of electrical energy; Canadian coal, freight rate on, 2828; agricultural conditions; Mr. Thomas Bradshaw, evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; agricultural conditions in United States; rural credits; rural depopulation; prices, spread between producer and consumer; reciprocity, 2829
Business of the House
Committees, reports, qu. 2612
Private members' day, 1160
Progress of, 2469
Sessional programme, 2469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Returns, 3399
Sale of ships, qu. 2613, 2828, 2518, 3846
Shipping combines, 3846
Canadian National railways, 2828
Advance $73,000,000, 3619
Management, 3620
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Rates, 1761
Securities, 4526
Toronto office building, qu. 1663, 2518
Canadian Press Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games, 4707
Capital and labour, 2583
Chicago drainage canal, diversion, qu. 3821
Civil service, underpaid, 4672
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel Supply

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Freight rate, 2828
Imports, qu. 516
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2583
Combines bill, 2583, 2634
Combines, prosecutions of, qu. 1662
Copper bounty bill, 3238
Cost of living inquiry, qu. 3703
Deputy ministers salaries, 4672
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Elevators
Edmonton, 4721
Ontario, 2038, 4719, 4721
Emigration to United States, 2822
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Euclid hall and Brant house, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Expenditure on wharves, 4568
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4742
Freight rates
Operating costs and, 1761
Railway rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1969
Shipping, Railway Commission control, qu. 2611
Fuel supply
Freight rates, 1268, 2828
M. for a national fuel policy, 1262
Nova Scotia coal, 1269
Special committee, appointment, qu. 617
Transportation, 3200
Grain shipments, 3775
Grand Trunk. *See also under this title.* Canadian National railways
Commitments, qu. 207
Electrification, qu. 283
Halifax elevator, 4721
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4562
Historic sites, preservation of, 3249, 4707
Housing, legislation, qu. 2517, 2822
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4681
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement of, 2774
Hydro electric, power supply, 1266, 1270, 2828
Imperial conference, 4661
Income War Tax Act Amdt, bill, 4493
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Judges serving on royal commissions, 3604
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Military hospitals, 696, 4075, 4303
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 4743
Moose Jaw election, 2774
National fuel policy, M., 1262
Near East Crisis, 1266
Newsprint, export duty, 1267

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Ontario grain elevators, 2038, 4719, 4721
Old age pensions, legislation, qu. 2517, 2827
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3873, 4749
Pensions
British Expeditionary force, 3885
Fenian raid, 3873
Royal commission, report, qu. 2516
South African war, 3873
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779, 2824
Post office salaries, 1780
Prices, high, 2583, 2820, 2822
Proportional representation, 424
Public ownership, 2475, 3622, 3847
Pulpwod, export duty on, 2828
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Railway excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Redistribution Committee report, qu. 2612
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3773
Power development, qu. 490
United States, negotiations, 3208, 3705, 4513
Shipping combines, 2828, 3846, 3848
Soldiers, destitute, burial of, 695
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, 3507
Steamship services
Extension to Great Lakes, 2175
Rates, control of, 2174
St. Lawrence-Great Lakes, ships, qu. 2613
Taxation
High, 2583, 2823
"Taxed to death," 4493
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 3282, 4621, 4624
Postal receipts, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Post office building, 1780
Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506
Union station, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 4011, 4441, 4442
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Unemployment relief, 690
United Farmers of Ontario, 2824
Co-operative stores, 4068
Platform, 4661
Water powers
Electrical energy, export, 2828
National policy, development, 1270
Welland canal construction
Expenditure, qu. 3820
Request for, 3774

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Woollen industry, legislation to assist, 2823, 2827, qu. 4184
Churches, capitalistic system and, 2725
Churchill, Fort. *See* Hudson Bay Railway
Cigars and Cigarettes. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Inland Revenue bill; Taxation; Tobacco
Civil Rights. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Labour, right to organize; Woodsworth
Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power); Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references, generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Act. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence
Appointments, 208. *See also under this title,* Commission
After 1911 election, 2920
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Local committee and, 2816
Postal, 1800. *See also* Post Office
Postmasters. *See* Post Office
Promotions and, 330
Returned soldiers, 386, 1797, 1799
Services and, unnecessary, 2969
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, qu. 2297
Temporary employees made permanent, qu. 4814
Year 1922, 3324
Arthur Young Company, cost of, qu. 1137
Bonus, qu. 204, 1664, 1812, 3352
Employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Dependents, non-resident, 1811
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, employees, 1751, 1752, 1772
Interim supply bill, 3705
Salaries and, qu. 2179
Vote, 1811
Calder Act, 2926, 3266. *See* also Public Service Retirement Act
Statement of, 3402
Civil service list, publication of, qu. 3134
Classification. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Commission.
Abolition, proposed. *See* Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power)
Advice by local committees, 2816
Agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, 4675
"A joke; a farce," 3347
Alleged partisanship, 3347
Anderson, Mr., 1821

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Annual report tabled, 3887
Appointments
British Columbia in, 372
Combines, staff, 2661
Delay in making, 1086, 3292
Fruit inspectors, 3150
Immigration Department
Black, Mr. W. J., 2664
Immigration agents, 1188, 2663
Bowder, Mr., 1199
Chinese immigration officials, 2308, 2482
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085-6
May, Mr., 2663
Indian affairs
Agents, 2151
Doctors, 2160
Live stock Act, inspectors, 3150
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3284, 3290, 3303. *See also* Marshall
Montreal post office, qu. 1361
Postmasters, 1798, 1800, 1801, 1823. *See also* Post Office.
Clementsport, N.S., 1795
Disregarded, 1821-22
Returned soldiers as, 1799
St. Peter's N.S., 1795
Soldier advisers, 3747
Temporary, 2663
Without regard to politics, 3345
Civil Service Act, withdrawal of positions from 561, 914
Commissioners, appointment of, 3348
Cost of, 370, 525, 530
In 1917-1922, qu. 1137
Employees, number of, 370, 3986
And cost, 2970
Temporary, 1385
Employment service, director of, 1676
Examination, 366, 2816, 3986
Exceptions, 1821
House of Commons staff, 2691
Jurisdiction
Positions exempted from, 561, 914
Removal of certain classes from, qu. 278. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Technical officers, removal of, 519
Lightkeepers, 3351
Political patronage, 3347
Postmasters, appointments and dismissals. *See* Post Office
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2502
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Report, 812
Roche, Hon. Dr., 354, 3348

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Staff, number of, See under this title Employes
Unconstitutionality of, 2816
Committee of the House. *See* Civil Service Act
Cost, 2756, 3076
Deputy ministers
Committee, report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Powers of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Salaries, 4557, 4667
Dismissals, 856
Appointments and, after 1911 election, 2817, 2920, 3344, 3345, 3349
In 1922, 3324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, employees, 3252
Economy in. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Employees, number of, 2970, 3264
And salaries, 1912 and 1922, 2712
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Examinations, 366, 2816, 3986
Exemptions, 354, 367
Expenditure, 2785, 2915, 2987, 3027
Reduction in England, 1803
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Cost of, qu. 1137
Verrett, Mr. Hector, 1826
History of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Hours, 1427
Holidays and, 24
Inside service, employees, 911
Interim supply bill, 3705
"Lady who rides to work in automobile" 1772
List, publication of, qu. 3134
Merit system. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Murray, Sir George, report, 3343
Offensive partisanship, dismissals for, 285, 3344
Political patronage, 2816, 3344. *See also* Civil Service Act
Positions excluded from Act, 1156
Post Office department
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Postmasters, dismissals. *See* Post Office
Public Service retirement. *See that title*
Quebec and district employees, 387

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 39-40, 409
Reorganization, 24. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826, 2817
Responsibility, 368
Retiring allowances, Printing Bureau, 3949
Returned soldiers, 1772
Appointments, 386, 1797, 1799
Dismissals, 1772
Salaries, 2805, 3070, 4672. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Bonus and, qu. 2179
Revision,, qu. 204, 1794
Statement by Prime Minister, 1811
Total expenditure, qu. 2086
Seasonal or temporary employment, *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. bill
Statistics, qu. 207
Superannuation, 4593. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Boville, Mr. T. C., qu. 3135
Calder Act, 2926, 3266
Cost of, 2785
Coulter, Dr. R. M., qu. 3135
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, qu. 3135
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 940, 3266
Statement of Prime Minister, 4593
Technical and professional officials, 367, 815
Temporary employees, made permanent, 1385
Underpaid, 4672
Whitley councils, 1654
Women, employment of, 1772
Work outside regular duties, 1675

Civil Service Act. *See also* Civil Service
Abolition of. *See under this title,* M. (Mr. Power)
Alleged violation of, 1794
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 519
Amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for special committee, 534; agreed to on div. 571
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
"Notwithstanding anything in Act" 3276
Special Committee of inquiry, 2970
Appointment of, 936, 986
Membership, change in, 2417
Order of reference, 1256
Pope, Sir Joseph, evidence before, 2970
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4248
M. to concur, withdrawn, 4592-3
Privilege, Mr. Martell, 4363

Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt. Bill
(Seasonal or temporary employment)—Mr. German—1r., 666

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Repeal of clause permitting additions to term of service) 1r., 2896-7; 2r., com., 3146; 3r., 3147

Civilization, evolution of, 1856

Citizen's Liberty League, 715

Citizenship. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3093-3126, 3219
British Columbia
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Fishing licenses, M., 1540
Oriental immigration, 507, 1217, 2310
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Privilege, equalization of rates, 1911
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2404-06
Canadian Air Force, Hudson Bay route, 1748, 1750
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1920, 3274
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-19
Students, 2314
Creosoted lumber and timber
Duties, qu. 813
Use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Vancouver Creosoting Company, limited, 3231
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 1920, 3274
Equalization of railway rates. *See under* this title, Freight Rates
Firebrick, duty, 3896
Freight rates
Railway rates, equalization of, M. 1284, 1490, 1910, 1914, 1956
Original motion, effect of, 1953
Privilege, 1910
Westward from prairie provinces, 1159
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Immigration
Oriental, 507, 1217, 2310-19
Policy, 1217
Liquor
Export, qu. 1260
Warehouse licenses, British Columbia, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Medical staff, 675

Clark, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Military hospitals—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
New York, Canadian customs officer, 1920 3274
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Panama canal, competition, 1920
Pension Act, administration of, 682
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3867-3886
Amdt. death within five years, 3884; agreed to, 3885
Senate amendments, 4745
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3730
Federal appeal board, 4703
Royal commission on, report, 675
Privilege, equalization of railway rates, 1910
Salmon-canning industry, licenses, 1540
Soldiers
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment, 695
Vetcraft shops, 695
Stanley park foreshore protection, 1008
United States army, mental tests, 1219
Vancouver harbour bill, 268
Vancouver income tax offices, qu. 912

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534

Clifford, Mr. L. O. (South Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Orin D., claim, 626

Climate
Emigration and, 2747, 2823
Winter conditions in Canadian Northwest, Nebraska and Iowa, 1423

Closure. *See* House of Commons

Clothing, duty on, 2981. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Textiles

Clyde, The, mechanics from, 1204

Coal. *See also* Freight Rates; Fuel; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Railways
Alberta, 709, 1247, 1262, 1264, 1268, 1275-82, 3424, qu. 4437, 4692
Freight rates on, 1268, 1272, 1275, 1282, 3009, 3781
Suggested rate of $6 per ton, 1276
Heating appliances for, 4629
Shipment
Hudson bay railway, 1055
Ontario, to, 1163
All-British supply, 1268
Anthracite
Duty, 3493
Supply, 1262, 4692
Welsh, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199

Coal—*Con.*
Areas in Canada, 1344
Bituminous, 83
Duty, 1275, 1278
Edmonton Board of Trade, res, 1275
Briquetting, 789, 3206
Brule lake deposits, 4699
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3807, 3814, 3826
Canadian National railways
Purchases, qu. 1363, 1561, 1564, qu. 4303
Alberta, qu. 4437
United States, qu. 4511
Chimney Corner, N.S., 941
Coke, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1273, 3199
Coke ovens, establishment, 788
Cost of. *See* Cost of Living; Price
Deposits, 2750
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994, 2654
Embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Export, 1275
United States, from, 1249, 1265, 1277
Freight rates, 795, 1268, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3621. *See also that title*
Mines and Minerals Committee, 4514
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502, 3128, 3146, 3222
Cancellation, 3146
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supplies, 1263
Hudson bay region, 1073
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Imports, qu. 516, 1266, 2828
And production, qu. 490
From United States, 1249, 1277
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
"Invisible" 1262
Lands, 1344. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Leases, 3424. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Petition of Right Act
Disbursements, repayments, 3129
Hoppe-Isenberg. *See under this title,* Hoppe and Isenberg
Lignite, 789
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206
Duty, 3493
Miners
Importation of from Belgium, 1177
Oriental, 1901
Strikes. *See* Labour, Strikes
Mines, 2785
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Public ownership, 2727, 3205
Mines and Minerals Committee report, 4743
National fuel policy, M. (Mr. Church) 1262
New Brunswick, 804

Coal—*Con.*
Northern Ontario, 1050
Nova Scotia, 83, 800
Freight rates, 3781
Miners' strike, 1627
Ontario, reported discovery, 2512
Peace river district, 1433
Price, 2824, 3198
Production
British Columbia, 1244
Canada, 2780
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Public ownership, 2785, 3205
Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Purchase of in United States, 3493, qu. 4511
Rates on, 1272. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association, 1275
Resources, 83, 1264
Scarcity, 254
Substitutes, 3199
Tariff, bituminous coal, 1275, 1278
Transportation, 789, 1264
United States embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Welsh anthracite, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199
Quality of, 1279

Coal Tar Derivatives, French Treaty, 1986

Coast Range Steel Company, 2508

Coastal Regulations. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Freight Rates, Shipping
Suspension of, 4219, 4222, 4231, 4235, 4276, 4290

Cobalt Products. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Cobden, Richard, British Free Trade, 3050

Cobourg, Ont., breakwater, 981

Cochrane, the late Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1033, 1046

Code Napoleon, 1558, 1526

Coke. *See* Coal

Cold Storage. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dairying Industry
Canadian-Australian boats, 1848
Co-operative, 2054
Dairying and, 2764, 2978
Eggs, producer and consumer, 1852
Incorporated companies, 2058
Mechanical, 2056
Montreal, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204, 3289

Cold Storage—*Con.*
Municipal, 2054
Plants, 104
Montreal, qu. 2204, 3289
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2055

Cold Storage Act Amdt. Bill
(Subsidy contracts with co-operative societies or associations and municipalities)
Res. 184; 1r., 191; 2r., 271-276; ref. to Com. on Agriculture 276; com., 2054; 3r., 2086, 2199

Collison, Mr. B. W., Rocky Mountains park, 1739

Colombia, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Colonial Status. *See* Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Colonization. *See* Agriculture; Building; Farm Homes; Immigration, Canada Colonization Association; Labour; Soldier Settlement

Colt Machine Guns. *See* National Defence

Combines, 145, 3072. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Prices; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Transportation
Agriculture and, 2786, 2787
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2521, 2527
Banana trust, 2979
Banking system, 4019, 4047, 4083
Big business, 2603
Big interests, 2559
Great Britain in, 2726
Political parties and, 2855
Binder twine, 4376
British North America Act, amendment, 2592
British Parliamentary Com. on trusts, 2544
British preference, 2989
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canadian Press, Limited, 4727
Coal situation and, 254
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Control, 2725
Co-operative buying and, 3018
Cotton manufacturers, 2534, 3464
Dominion Textile Company, 2563
Duties, reduction of, 2608

Combines—*Con.*
Federal jurisdiction over. *See* speeches on Combines bill
Legislation, 39, 145. *See also* Combines bill
Lumber, 2593
Master Plumbers & Steamfitters' Association, decision, 2593
Milk, 2526, 2559, 2569, 2593
Modern business organization, 2524
Money, 648, 4026
Newspaper, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, qu. 2613
Price-fixing, 2606, 2786
Printing, 1623
Privy Council decisions, 2585
Prosecutions, qu. 1662
Restaurant trust, 2584
Sherman anti-trust law, 2602
Shipping, 1440, 2127, 2174, 2578, 2583, 2584, 2613, 2666, 2828, 2928, 2954, 2960, 3789, 3845, 3848, 4077, 4223, 4226, 4277. *See also* Agricultural Conditions, Special Committee; Freight rates, shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613
Great Lakes, qu. 1362
Statement in Toronto Globe, qu. 1362
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Tariff and, 2714
Transportation, 1395. *See also* Freight Rates
United Farmers of Ontario, 2584
United Shoe Machinery Company, 2557, 2560
Webb, Mr. Sydney, report, 2545, 2551
Wheat Board, 2547, 2616, 2857
Wheat pool, 2526
Wholesale grocers case, decision, 2051, 2521

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2521
Appeal Court of Ontario, decisions, 2527
Privy Council decisions, 2527, 2590

Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Repeal, 2521

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill, (Investigation of alleged combines) Res. 938, 987; 1r., 993; 2r., 2519-2609 on division, 2609; com., 2610, 2615, 2659, 3r., 2701; Senate amendments, 3505
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for investigation, *See under this title* Investigation
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2521, 2527

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Big interests, 2584
Combination no crime, 2527
Combine, definition of, 2520, 2525, 2560, 2595, 2615, 2666
Commissioners, appointment of, 2522, 2626
Competition
Control of, 2526
Lessening of, 2526
Complaints, 2521
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Counsel
Conduct of investigation by, 2632
Representation by, 2618
Division on M. for 2r., 2609
Documents, 2521
Enforcement of, 4229
Experts, employment of, 2631
Inquiry as to, 496
Inquisitorial, 2527, 2608
Investigation
Application for, 2616
Restricted to British subjects, 2617
To be made by six persons, 2617
Grand Jury system of, amdt. (Mr. Church) 2585
Powers of registrar, 2626
Private, 2522
Under Enquiries Act, 2522
No person excused, 2631
Parliament
Jurisdiction, 2521-2609
Right to investigate, 2666
Power to reduce tariff, 3049
Patents, revocation of, 2522
Prices, fixing of, 2520
Privy Council decision, 2559, 2590
Proceedings in private, 2632
Profits, regulation of, 2558, 2585
Publicity, 2522
Registrar, 2522, 2616
Appointments of 2628, 2660
Power to investigate, 2626
Shall cause inquiries, 2618
To report and minister to decide as to further inquiry, 2626
Regulations, 2665
Report, distribution of, 2632-4, 2659
Re-sale price, 2525
Staff, appointment of, 2660
Tariff, reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561
Technicality not to invalidate proceedings, 2665

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Trade unions not affected, 2666
Witnesses, evidence and production of papers, 2631

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade and Commerce

Commercial Agents. *See* Trade

Commercial Intelligence Service. *See* Trade and Commerce

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions, government by. *See* Civil Service Commission; Government

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Prices, 1083, 1851. *See also* speeches on Budget; Prices

Commonwealth Club of California, immigration, 1195

Community Clubs. *See* Immigration

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
1. Mining companies, permission to pay dividends out of capital—Mr. German—1r., 435
2. Private company; shares without nominal or par value; capital, etc.—Mr. Copp—1r., 3261; 2r., com., 4208; 3r., 4218; Senate amendments, 4736

Sections and subjects discussed:
Amount of capital required, 4210
Annual meeting, 4215
Annual returns, 4215
Borrowing powers, 4213
By-laws for increase or decrease of number, 4215
By-law to be sanctioned, 4214
Capital
Increase of, 4213
Reduction of, 4213
Change of name, 4211
Commission for securing subscriptions, 4212
Directors
Powers, 4212
Qualifications, 4215
Dividends payable out of wasting assets, 4214
Issue of shares without nominal or par value, 4208

Companies Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Meetings of creditors, 4216
Private company may become public company, 4212
Prospectus, requirements as to particulars, 4212
Repeal, 4212
Stock of other companies, purchases, 4212
Subscriptions in return, 4215
Summary to be filed, 4216
When company may be created a private company, 4208

Compensation for Cattle. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock

Competitive Examinations. *See* Civil Service

Conciliation and Labour Act. *See* Labour

Concurrence. *See* Interim Supply; Supply

Condensed Milk. *See* Dairying Industry

Confectionery and Beverages Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Confederation. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Charlottetown conference, 1368
Debate, 1367
Intercolonial railway, 1756
Nova Scotia, attitude towards, 1376
Quebec conference, 1368
Senate, nominative or elective, 1366

Conferences, 3411. *See also* Imperial Disarmament, 2911, 4000
International Labour. *See* Labour

Confidence, Lack of. *See* Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Congdon, Mr. Fred T.
Appointment as commissioner, 2710, qu. 3131. *See also* Canadian National railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Correspondence with Justice dept., 2299

Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183

Connaught Park Jockey Club. *See* Race Track Betting

Connaught Place Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials, Ottawa

Conscription, 2816
"Infamous and anti-Canadian," 3038
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, and, 3015
Men and wealth, of, 2729

Conseil National des Métiers, qu. 3141

Conservative Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Political Parties
Administration, 1911-1921, 3038
Agricultural implements duty, 2974
Alleged understanding on Mr. Shaw's amendment to Address, 987
History of party. *See* Proportional Representation
National policy, 3067
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Pledges, violation of, 2974
Tariff policy, 3063
Tariff resolution of 1922, 2220

Constituencies, Redistribution of. *See* Redistribution Bill

Constitution, right of Canada to make her own, 1378

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Budget; Imperial Conference; Lack of Confidence Vote; Treaties; Halibut

Consular Agents. *See* Trade

Consumer. *See also* Address; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Prices; Purchasing Power; Taxation
French Treaty and, 3049
Italian treaty and, 3049
Oleomargarine, 3534
Prices. *See also that title*
Meat, 2877
Producer and consumer, 2829, 2972, 3029
Purchasing power, 2812
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Relief of, 2718
Renovated butter, 4251
Sales tax increases passed on to, 2859, 2804, 2998
Sugar duty, 2987
Tariff and, 2854, 3054
Taxation, 2789, 2801, 4415
Wheat board, 2857

Consumption Tax. *See* Taxation

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Containers, Fruit. *See* Sale and Inspection

Contrecœur wharf, 950-1008

Conventions, Trade. *See* Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Conversion Loan. *See* Loans

Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179

Co-operation
Agricultural products, distribution, 1852, 2869
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253. *See also* Markets; Prices
Co-operative association and societies, 3073. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt bill
Cold storage, 2054
Failure of, 1419
Co-operative credit associations, 4038
Industrial and financial organizations, 2589
Industrial relations, 2895
Town and country, between, 2972

Co-ordination. *See* National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agricultural and manufactured products, prices, 1851
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Agricultural implements, prices, 1407
Alberta
Oil bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling and prospecting, 781
Assignments in bankruptcy, qu. 937, 1412
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4072, 4077-4146, 4140
Interest
Circulation redemption fund on, amdt. 4093, neg. 4093
Maximum rate, amdt. 4125, neg. 4131; 4149, neg. 4149
Issuing of notes, 4092
Shareholders' audit, auditors to report to Minister, amdt. 4090, neg. 4091
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4145
Banks and Banking
Cost of living, 1409
Returns, 3264
British preference, cotton goods, 3463
Business of the House, bill not printed, 3974
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, grain shipments, qu. 3263
Canadian National parks, leasing, 3442
Canadian National Railways
Directors, address and occupation, qu. 1973
Hotels, 938
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Removal of, 3189
Statements of, 1869
Combines, shipping, 2613
Copper bounty bill, 3236, 3240
Cost of living increase, 1408
Crude petroleum bounties 781
Dairying industry, 1851
Dominion Textiles Company, securities and dividends, 3463
Dry Dock Subsidies bill, 3979

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Eggs, price of, 1851
Emigration to the United States, 1412
Experimental farms, 479
Farmers, purchasing power, 1408
Freight rates, increase, 3190
Geological survey, 2508
Grain and grain trade
Government elevator system, 3264
Grain Act, administration
Dockage, 782, qu. 3141
Grain Commissioners, board of
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Names, etc., qu. 2206
Grain Elevator Commission, qu. 1867
Montreal shipments, qu. 1973, qu. 1974
Shipping rates, M., 2517, 2613
Shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Hansard, subscription rate, 1715
Harbours and rivers, 948
Hemp bounty, 3913
Highwood river, power, 3427
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502
Immigration
Advertising, 1114
Policy, 1407
Immigration Act Amdt. bill 3981
Inflation, inequalities of, 1447
Iron ore, Alberta, 2512
Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpoena, 4145
National Gallery, M. to reduce vote, 1018
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Privilege—correction of press report, 2519
Public Works, expenditures by provinces, qu. 3887
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2494, 2500
Railway Commission, qu. 1973
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., statement of, 3188
Statements of, 1869
Robb, Hon. Mr., visit to Australia, 1850
Rugs, purchase of, qu. 1486
Rural depopulation, 1855
Seed grain advances, 3445
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement, 2030
Amounts due Dominion govt., qu. 814
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139
Vancouver elevator, qu. 1487
Vancouver harbour bill, 265
War claims, 2498

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Water powers, 3427, 3442
Woollen industry, condition of, 3463

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Civil Service
Commission
Annual report, 3887
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Employees, return showing, 911
Civil Service Act Special Com., report, 4248
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3261, 4208, 4217, 4736
Dorchester penitentiary, 770
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 1384, 2107, 2113, 2182, 2199, 2437-54, 3983
Discretion to Secretary of State, 2447
Judges, 2441, 2446
Justice department, opinion of, 2441
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1017
Public Archives, 3985
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2498
Returns, inquiries for, 3324
Secretary of State department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 2503
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500

Copper. *See* Mines and Minerals

Copper Bars or Rods, bounty on, 2703, 2709, 2778, 4369. *See also* Bounties

Copyright. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs
United States, 2289

Copyright Act. *See also* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
M. (Mr. Rinfret) 495

Copyright Act Amendment Bill
(Compliance with British and international copyright acts.) 1r., 487; 2r., com., 2139; com., 2287; 3r., 2436; Senate amendments, 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) licenses and importation of books, 2291, agreed to on div. 2292
Ref. to, 2344
Authors, memorandum on behalf of, 3155
Berne Convention, 2139, 2288, 2343, 3155
Civil servant, alleged communication to Le Droit D'Auteur, 2140

Copyright Act Amendment Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Commencement of act, 2145, 2287
Great Britain and, 2140
Le Droit d'Auteur, 2140, 2343
Legislation, history of, 2343
Licenses, importation, 2139, 2287, 2291, 2344
Piracy, 2287
Song writers, 2287

Cordage and Rope
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp
Production in Canada, 2780

Corless, Dr., Hudson bay district, 1040

Corn Laws. *See* Great Britain

Cornwall Canal employees, qu. 3135

Corporations, profits, 1209. *See also* Combines; Immigration

Corsets, duty, 3048

Cory, Mr. W. W. *See* Interior

Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217

Cossar, Dr. George C., immigration, 1471

Cost of Living, 1394, 1812, 2704, 2736, 2835. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Combines; Consumer; Immigration; Labour, Unemployment; Prices; Taxation
Banks and, 1409
Budget and, 1410, 1812
Canada and Great Britain, 3468, 3472
Canada and United States, comparison, 3073
Canada, one of most expensive countries, 2715
Charts, 1700
Clerical classes, 3534
Coal, cost of, 1345, 1813. *See also* Coal
Combines and, 2599. *See also* Combines
Consumer and, 2585
Curve, formerly descending now ascending, 3000
Customs and excise duties, 2839
Decrease of, 1700, 1907
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3465
Dumping clause and, 2535
Emigration and, 2790. *See also* Emigration
"Free breakfast table" 2824
Freight rates and, 1958
Government investigation, inquiry, qu. 3703
Increase of, 1853
Labour Gazette figures, 1812
Liberal platform, 1410
Living within income, 2959

Cost of Living—*Con.*
Members of Parliament. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Michell, Prof., figures, 1700, 1812
Necessity for lower, 1412, 1437
Oleomargarine, 3508-3580
Prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Producer and consumer, 2713, 2972
Spread between, 2787
Production, cost of, 2815
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
R. G. Dun & Company, figures, 1812
Special Committee on, 2569
Standard of living, 2959
Statistics, 1684
Tariff and, 2737, 2839, 3048
Reductions offset by sales tax, 3033
Taxation, 2839. *See also that title*
Sales tax, 1813, 2839, 2997
Unorganized workers, 3534
Wages, 2890, 2982. *See also* Labour
Workingman, 2982

Cotton. *See* Textiles; Treaties, French

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, Vancouver dry dock, 1002

Coulter, Dr. R. M. *See* Post Office

Courtenay Bay. *See* St. John

Craig, Mr. Charles P., qu. 204

Cranfield, Mr. W. T., publicity agent in London, 2927, 2983, 4707

Crawford, Mr., letter to Minister of Immigration, 1396

Crean, Mr. Frank J. B., resources of northern Saskatchewan, 1060

Creditors. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Credits. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Finance; Housing; Loans; Money
Agricultural. *See under this title,* Rural
Credit and industry, 626, 645, 650
Douglas credit scheme, 631
Economic problem and, 647
Farm. *See under this title,* Rural
Function and relation to industrial problems
M. (Mr. Irvine) for special com., 626
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com. 645, agreed to, 651
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) ruled out of order, 643
Improved system, 1252
Monopoly, 648, 4018, 4045
New York loan, April 1922, 2963
Prices and, 4226

Credits—*Con.*
Rural, 639, 640, 1088, 1438, 1907, 2751, 2836, 2869, 2929, 3024, 3060, 3066, 4014, 4016, 4035, 4039, 4041, 4045, 4046, 4066, 4071, 4130, 4144, 4146, 4298
Interest rates, 2962
United States, 642, 2829, 2930
United States system, 4043
Withheld, 3074

Creelman, Dr. George. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Imports of farm produce, 1426

Creosoting Industry, 1245, 3234
Creosoted piling, use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Lumber and timber, customs duty, qu. 813
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3231

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette)
Banking and Commerce Com., retirement from, 2639
Civil Service statistics, qu. 207
Resignation as leader of Progressive party, 11, 35

Crime. *See* Criminal Code; Justice, Penitentiaries

Criminal Code. *See also* Criminal Code Amdts.
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051
Board of Commerce and, 2521
Combines, 2521, 2527, 2592. *See also* Combines
Enforcement of, 4229
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Labour, right to organize, 2890
Race-track betting, 709

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills
1. Capital punishment abolition of (Mr. Irvine) 1r., 180; 1r., second time by error in order paper, 487; explanation of error, 519; opportunity for consideration, inquiry, 1810
2. Scrip frauds. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 730
3. Registration of declaration of ownership by proprietors of newspapers (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
4. Opium joints; betting information; age of consent; carnal knowledge; illegal use of badge; appeals (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1483; 2r., com., 2281; 3r., 2284; Senate amendments, 4733
5. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 616

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
6. Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1971; 2r., com., 2053; 3r., 2054

Criminal Matters, procedure, qu. 1974

Crops. *See* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade

Cross Benches. *See* McMaster

Cross Point, Que., wharf, 955

Crown Lands. *See* Lands

Crowsnest Pass Agreement, 1563, 1620. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Railway; Freight Rates; Progressive Party
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
Extension, 2741

Crude Oil. *See* Oil; Petroleum

Crude Petroleum. *See* Petroleum

Cuba, trade with, 308. *See also* Steamship Services; West Indies

Cummings Cove, wharf, 945

Cunard Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Curie, Monsieur and Madame, discovery of radium, 1287

Currants. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Depreciated, 2988, 4027. *See* Money; Purchasing Power
Inflation. *See* Germany, Reparations

Currie, General Sir Arthur, directorships, 4025

Curzon, Lord, of Kedleston, signature of Italian treaty, 2403

Custodians. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation; Trade; Treaties
Average tariff rate 2838
Averages and valuation 90
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260. *See also* Liquor
British preference. *See that title*

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Canadian customs officer at New York. *See under this title,* New York
Collections
Cost of, qu. 814
For 1922, 22
Per capita, Canada and United States, 2738
Customs duties. *See also* Customs Tariff
Agricultural and animal products, qu. 1992
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2740, 2743, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
Automobiles, 2908, 3075
Collections, 1921-22 and 1922-23, 2838
Creosoted lumber and piling, qu. 813
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3272
Goods shipped from Vancouver to Halifax via Panama canal, 2615
Hemp seed, 3474
Lowering, 2221
Nursery stock, 4432
Reduction. *See* British preference; Budget; Treaties, French treaty
Tomato plants, 4432
Wool, 2866
Department
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283, 816
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4669
Employees, 3282
Estimates, 3272
Halton county officials, 914
Legal work, transfer of, 856
Medicine Hat employees, qu. 3505
Officials, salaries, etc., qu. 3892
Salaries and contingencies, 3272
Depreciated currency clause, 2988
Drawbacks, qu. 1484
Antiseptic surgical dressing, 2655
Artificial silk tops and yarns, 3489, 3896
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper in blocks or ingots, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Machinery and parts, 2655
Oil, 2655
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3503
Raw materials, qu. 1864
Imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259
Steel, coal and woollen goods, qu. 1994
Sugar, 2655
Dumping clause, 2646, 3072, 2988
Sugar, 3046
Excise. *See also* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation
Beer, qu. 518

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Beet sugar, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393. *See also* Sugar
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and beverages
Cigarettes, 2706, 2825, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 3229, 4392
Cigars and, consumption, qu. 516
516
Smuggling, 3230
Confectionery and beverage tax, revenue, qu. 624, 2644, 2656, 2707, 2979, 3046
Duties, 3026
Payment by consumer, 2839
Irritating taxes, 2858
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 1820, 2979 3927, 3937, 4435
Revenue, loss of, 1983
Taxation, 3010
Tobacco, duty collected, qu. 1259
Wines, 452, qu. 518, 1977, 2656, 2742, 3036, 3937, 4425
Canadian, 2643, 2710
Hawkesbury, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Inspectors, immigration, 1874
Marking Act, 931, qu. 616, 2988
Montreal
Customs house, and revenue 3280
Newsprint, 3046. *See also* Pulp and Paper
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272
Transfer of goods at, 3272
Printing presses, duty, 2858
Pulpwood, export tax on, 2828. *See also* Export Act
Raw materials, free, 2858
Seizures, qu. 620
Schooner Carrie L. Hirtle, qu. 3323
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 4621
Revenue, 3277
Valuation for duty, 90, 145. *See also under this title,* Customs duties

Customs Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill; Customs Tariff Items; Tariff

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill
Res. 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
Sections and subjects discussed:
British preference, discount of 10 per cent, 2650
Drawbacks, 2655
Reciprocity negotiations with United States, 2650
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Tariff changes, 2654

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
United States, duties against, reduction by order in council, 2650

Customs Tariff Items, 3454, 3895
Antiseptic surgical dressings, 2655
Artificial silk, 2645, 2820, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3069, 3075
Artificial fibre silk fabrics and, 2654, 3492
Manufactures, 2654
Tops and waste or artificial silk fibre tops and waste, 3489
Yarns, 2654, 3035, 3489
Barilla or soda ash, drawback, 2655, 3502
Beverages, 2979. *See also this title under* Customs and Excise
Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake, 2480, 2653, 3895
Boots and shoes, 2999, 3033
Boots, orthopaedic, 2654, 2750
Brass and copper scrap, 2653, 3483
Brass, iron or steel runners, rings, caps, etc. for umbrellas, 3501
Carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Casual donations, 2645, 2654
Cigarettes, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2825, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988
Coal, 2654
Anthracite and lignite, 3493
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental supplies, 2653, 3483
Cotton for manufacturers of pneumatic tires, 2654, 3487
Crude petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481
Cyanamid or lime nitrogen, 2654
Date when changes become effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 2653, 3480
Drawbacks, 3501. *See also this title* under Customs and Excise
Artificial silk tops and waste, 3896
Artificials silk yarn, filaments, etc, 3502
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper for manufacture of wire, 3503
Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Items enumerated in item 236, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Materials used in manufacture of goods enumerated in item 448c, 3503
Oil for manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502
Sugar, 2655, 3502
Dumping clause, 2535
Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony, 2653, 3034, 3481
Emery and carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Firebrick, 2653, 3035, 3481, 3896
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, hatters' tips and sides, 2654, 3500
Hemp seed, 2645, 2651, 3017
Iron or steel scrap, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Linen yarn, 3897
Liquorice in rolls and sticks, 2653, 3480
Liquorice paste, 2653, 3017, 3480
Machinery for conversion of fish waste, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Machinery not made in Canada, 2645, 2653, 2655, 3503
Malt flour, 2645, 2652, 3480
Manufactures of artificial silk or artificial fibre silk, 3492
Milk bottles, 3033
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502, 3901
Paper caps for milk bottles, 3033
Petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481. *See also* Bounties; Petroleum
Porcelain for pumps, 3033
Potatoes, 2651, 2707, 2959, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Printing and photographic presses and type-making accessories, 3486
Printing machinery, 2645, 2653, 2858
Prunes and dried plums, 2651, 3474
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 2651, qu. 2699, 2718, 2964, 2989, 3017, 3034, 3068, 3474, 3479
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474, 3479
Reciprocity with United States, 2649. *See also that title*
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Rolled iron and steel and cast steel for milling cutters, 2653, 3484
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Scrap iron, 3034
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Silks, 2645, 3046. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 2653, 3483
Staves of wood, 2654, 3487
Sticks or canes, 2654, 3501
Stumping machines, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Sugar, 2645, 2651, 2744, 2820, 2825, 2968, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3039, 3046, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping duty, 2646
Sulphate of copper, 3895
Typewriters and parts, 2653, 3485
Usual coverings containing goods not machinery, 3501

Customs Tariff Items—*Con.*
Value for home consumption, 2535
Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 2645, 2653, 3487

Czecho-Slovakia
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with France, 2219

Dairy Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Accredited herds, Health of Animals

Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. Bills
1. Butter substitutes and re-manufacture of butter. Res. 2518, 3150; 1r., 3154; M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3329, 3449, agreed to, 3451; notice of M. (Mr. Carroll) for 2r., 3399, 3402
Sections and subjects discussed:
Drafting, 3325
Oleomargarine, 3325
M. anticipating, 3326
Parliamentary counsel, 3325, 3449
2. Butter standard; renovated butter; milk or cream containing fat or oil other than that of milk. Res. 3961, 4251, 1r., 4344; 2r., com., 3r., 4510
Sections and subjects discussed:
Definition, 4510
Establishment of guilt for violation of act, 4510
Minimum standard of fat in butter, 4510

Dairying Industry, 609, 1851. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Industry Act; Live Stock; Oleomargarine
Alberta, 1839
Antipodean competition, 2765
Bacteriology, 462
Butter
Adulteration, 3150
British market, in, 2863
China shipments to, 1840, 1853
Compounds, 3152
Disease germs, 3295
Exports to France, 2217, 2273. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates 1961
Fresh, shipment from Enrope, 2273
Grading, 2765, 2864, 3151, 3283, 3297
Imitations of, 3152
Imports 2821, 2959
"Manna" 3152
Oleomargarine and, 386, 3508-81. *See also* Oleomargarine
Pasteurization, 3298
Price, 2821, 3513, 3533
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Butter—*Con.*
Quality 2863
Poor, 3516
Renovated, 3151. *See also* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Restrictions, 3153
Salt, too much, 2863, 3297
Standard of fat. *See* Dairy Industry Act
Substitutes, 3150
Weight, 3151
Certified milk. *See under this title,* Milk
Cheese
Acidity and bacteria, 3297
Bacteriology 462
China, shipment to, 1853
Cold storage, 2055
Disease germs, 3295
Grading, 2765, 3283, 3295
Imports, 2959
Prices, 3295
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Cold storage, 2978. *See also that title*
Co-operative, 2764
Cow-testing, 3284, 3297
Cream
Fermented, 3151
Pasteurizing, 3283
Dairy branch estimates, 609, 3283
Dairy cattle testing, 1307. *See also* Live Stock, Accredited herds
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Finch, combined cheese and butter factory, 3284, 3297
French treaty and, 1984
Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, 457, 2769
Leitch, Prof., evidence before Agricultural Conditions Com., 1843
Losses on cheese and butter, 2934
Markets, 2863
Milk
Certified, 3300
Fat or oil content. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Filled milk, 3152
Fraser Valley Association, 4265
Pasteurizing, 3283
Price of, 2559
Products, imports, qu. 617
Sale of in Toronto, 2731
Supply, monopolies and combines. *See* Combines bill
Modern methods, 2765
Montreal cold storage plant, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage
National Dairy Council of Canada, oleomargarine, 3269

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Products, grading, 2864
Representative in Great Britain, 3297
Research laboratory, 3297
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs., trip to New Zealand, 3283, 3288
Supplies, comparison of prices, 2740
Testing system, extension of, 3284
Unprofitable herds, 2863
Value of, 2863
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association, 4266
Whey, disease germs, 3299

Daly Building. *See* Public Buildings, Ottawa

Damage to Mortgaged Premises. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Canada's participation in war, 1536
Canadian National railways,, doctors, 814
Grand Trunk arbitration, 1307
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Newspapers and printing companies, 2298

Dartmouth, N.S. pier and dredging, 4568

Davidson Commission. *See* War

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Canadian National railways branch lines, 4195, 4323
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1051
Oliver-St. Paul branch line railway, 4323
Western provinces, treatment of, 4195
Wheat prices, 1886

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., deputy Governor General, 1809

Dawson, Mr. F. G., Prince Rupert. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Daylight Saving
Farmers and, 1427
Montreal post office, qu. 3143
Ottawa, qu. 2612
Parliament, departments and, qu. 2612

Deadman's Island, qu. 1362

Death Rate, 1197

Debates, Official. *See* House of Commons

Debt. *See also* Public Debt; Taxation
Capital levy, 2743
Domestic, 1343
Farmers and, 2768
Federal, provincial and municipal, per capita, 2720, 2721

Debt—*Con.*
Held in foreign countries, 1406
Immigration and. *See* Immigration
Outside of Canada, estimated, 2720
Pyramiding of, 2728
Readjustment of, 2981

Debtor. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Deceased Husband's Brother, Marriage with, Bill—Mr. McMaster, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Deceased Members, tributes to memory. *See* House of Commons

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3538

Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Deep Waterways. *See* St. Lawrence

Defeat of Government Motion. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Defence. *See* National Defence

Deficits. *See* speeches on Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Deflation. *See* Credit; Finance; Money; Prices; Purchasing Power

Delay in British Mails. *See* Post Office

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Grondines wharf, 968
Valcartier camp ground, qu. 2298

Demers, Mr. Amedee, mail contractor, qu. 1868

Democracy, Senate and. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Budget, 3038; sectional and local interests; tribute to Finance Minister, "the man of the hour"; Liberal and Conservative administrations; Conscription Act; extravagance in the name of freedom and civilization; change of government; improvement in financial situation; railway and shipping deficits; balanced budget; taxation, relief from; sales tax; income tax; exemption for children; taxation of dividends; unity of property; confidence in government; amendment, 3038

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration
Labour and, 1196
Policy, 1196
Montreal post office,
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
Waste paper, disposal, qu. 1028

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1519
Private members' days, 1158
Senate, M. for elective, 1364

Denmark
Bacon competition, 2864, 2865
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3296, 3515
Hog grading, 591
Immigration from, 1096
Land settlement policy, 1406
Oleomargarine, 3515, 3559
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Dennis, Mr. J. S. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Dentists, narcotic drugs for. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act

Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Act. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed mothers

Deportation. *See* Chinese Immigration bill; Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Narcotic Drugs

Depression, causes of, 2747. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration

Deputy Local Judges. *See* Admiralty Act

Deputy Ministers
Appointment of, 1805
Conference and report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Responsibility of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Retirement and superannuation, 891, 1822-5, qu. 3135, 3342
Salaries, increase, 4557, 4667

Deputy Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Rulings and statements. *See also* Marcil; Speaker

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Amendments
Form of, 65-66
Varying nature of grant, 4371
Bills
Amendments
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 3888
Proposed in committee, 4371
General argument not permissible on particular clause, 4063, 4073, 4244
Not printed, proceeding, 3968, 3974, 3976
Reading clauses, marginal notes sufficient, 3974
Relevancy, 3238, 3863, 4371
Chair
Criticism of, 2412, 4720
To be addressed, 897
Committee
Anticipation of clause, 4071
Items declared carried, 4704
Relevancy
General discussion permissible, 2414
Newspapers, reading from, 2412
Speeches in, 2137, 2309, 2342, 2414, 2481, 2482, 2624, 2664, 3239, 4025, 4051, 4054, 4058, 4063, 4074, 4191, 4374, 4534
Special, action not reviewable by Committee of Whole 4074
Conversation 4528, 4572, 4581
Debate
Interruptions, 4064
Mover closes, 657, 2602, 4361, 4363
Reference to matter sub judice, 3371
Relevancy, 1407, 1420, 2137, 4025
Debates, Official Report, 1638
Insertion of documents not read, 3174, 3789
Undiscussed item in supply, omission, 1638, 3285, 3292
Estimates, consideration en bloc, 4559, 4614, 4616
Interruptions, cannot prevent if member speaking does not object, 4192
Language, 4238, 4244
Letter reflecting on proceedings of House, 4060
Matters sub-judice, 3371
Member
May ask question but not make speech, 2774
Must confine remarks to section under discussion, 4244
Reflection on 4239
Speaking, not compelled to answer question, 1125, 4064

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Speaking not to be interrupted, 1420
Motions
Amendments, 245
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 4720
Discussion allowed pending decision, 316
To be in writing, 866
To increase taxation 3935, 3936, 3937
Orders of the day
Explanation in detail not in order, 2255
Reading letters 2254
Questions
Already answered, 3913
Irrelevant 2624, 3863
Supply
General discussion not permissible, 4559
Items
Agricultural Instruction grant, 3285
Classification of, 3287
Consideration en bloc, 4612
Minister not required to give information twice, 3386
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Reconsideration of item by unanimous consent, 609
Relevancy, 486, 594, 608, 778, 888, 898, 1014, 1846, 1902, 2154, 3197, 3250, 3253, 3291, 3293, 3371, 3424, 4558, 4559, 4562, 4566, 4602, 4688, 4699, 4719
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3285, 3292, 3293, 3294
Urgency, 4731

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries, Wrecks

Desbarats, Mr. G. J. *See* National Defence

Descente des femmes, Que. wharf, 955

Descoteaux, Mr. J. F. (Nicolet)
Introduced, 2837

Desertions
Canadian Air Force, 2418
Seamen. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Designs. *See* Trade Marks and Designs Act

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Cedar Rapids power, 659
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 379
Electric power, export of, M., 658
Emigration to the United States, 1241
Gaspe, natural resources, 1242
Immigration
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Domestic servants, 1243
Labour, attitude towards, 1241

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1243
Policy, 1241
United States from, 1243
Labour, unemployment, 1242
Metagen analysis of, qu. 1867
Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912
Montreal
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Public Works, chief architect's branch, qu. 2517
Wheat shipments to Montreal, qu. 385

Despatches. *See* Near East Crisis

Destructive Insects and Pests. *See also* Insect Pests
Administration of Act, 595, 3988

Detroit River, regulation of traffic, 3357

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1546
Canadian products, duty of Canadians to purchase, 1244
Coal production in British Columbia, 1244
Creosoting industry, 1245
Emigration to the United States, 1244
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4353
Free trade, effect of, 1246
Fuel oil importations, 1245
Fuel supply, 1247
Hemp bounty bill, 4390
Hindu franchise, 4661
Immigration
Oriental, 1247
Policy, 1244
Imperial Conference, 4661
Lumber industry of British Columbia, 1245
Nanaimo and Victoria harbours, 1014
Port Renfrew wharf, 1008
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4353
Reciprocity, 1246
Tariff equal to that of United States, 1246
Western provinces, conditions in, 1246

Digby, N.S.
Dredging, 4568
Pier, 942

Direct Importation. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Directory of government offices, qu. 2085

Disability Cases. *See* Pensions

Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. for Supply, 2347, neg, on div. 2391

Disallowance of Provincial Legislation. *See* Jurisdiction; Legislation

Disarmament. *See also* Great Lakes
Conference at Washington, 2911, 4000

Discrimination. *See* Freight Rates; Railway Act Amdt. bill

Diseases. *See* Health
Cattle, of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Dismissals. *See* Civil Service; Post Office,

Distressed Canadians. *See* Relief

Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Marine

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorces
Number granted, qu. 622
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971

Dockages. *See* Grain; Elevators

Doctors. *See also* Health; Military Hospitals; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Canadian National railways, qu. 814
Charges and standards of living, 2813
Indians, medical service, 2160
Medical and scientific discoveries. *See* Banting; Medical Research; Scientific Research
Narcotic drugs. *See that title*

Doherty, Mr Manning, cattle embargo removal, 2871

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization Act, 2447, 2463-65
Payments to, 1154
Pension, qu. 1029

Doherty Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill

Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, Ont., 3433

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic Servants. *See* Immigration; Labour

Dominion Archives. *See* Public Archives

Dominion Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Dominion Astrophysical Observatory. *See* Interior

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420

Dominion Cotton Mills. *See* Textiles

Dominion Elections Act. *See also* Elections; Proportional Representation
Amendments, inquiry as to, 1027
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways, Express

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See also* Forests and Forestry
(Description of areas 1r., 1256; 2r., com., 2060; 3r., 2086

Dominion Fuel Board. *See* Fuel Supply

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, industrial disputes, 1703

Dominion Lands. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands Act; Dominion Lands and Parks; Lands
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Drainage. *See under this title,* Reclamation
Free land available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Grants to railways, 1353
Grazing lands, 3424
Leases, sale of, 3424
Homesteads. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Patents in event of death or insanity, 3398
Pre-emption and purchases, qu. 1030
Reversion to Dominion government, 3257
Second. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
In southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Valuation and revision of, 3398
Homesteaders, relief, 3447
Hudson Bay railway, land sales, 1053, 1068
Indian title, extinguishment of, 3398
Interest rates on deferred payments, 1088-9
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 1031
Allocation to Hudson Bay railway, 1353, qu. 2393
Reclamation, 3257, 3428, 3430. *See also* Irrigation

Dominion Lands—*Con.*
Reclamation—*Con.*
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Carrot river district, 3431
Kootenay flats, 3431
Lesser Slave lake, 3430
Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Moose range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
Waterhen lake district, 3431, qu. 4303
School lands, 3398, 4202
Balance due on purchase price, 1385, 1389. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.
Reversion of, 3445
Southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Timber, permit to cut, 203, 3398
Unorganized districts, 3258

Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bills
1. Coal lands and mining rights, 1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3149; 3r., 3150
2. Homestead valuations; second homesteads; issue of patents in event of death or insanity; school lands; permits to cut timber; extinguishment of Indian titles. Res. 3398, 3982; 1r., 2r., com., 3983; com., 4201, 4364; 3r., 4369
Sections and subjects discussed
Governor in Council may authorize inquiry, 4206
Issue of patent after death of applicant, 4202
Issue of patent if applicant becomes insane, 4202
No employee to purchase Dominion lands, 4206
Sections set apart as school lands, 4202
Terms of payment for school lands, 4202
Timber limits, areas, 4206
Transfer to another homestead, 4202, 4364

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3938, 4702. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Appointments, 3252
Cloakey, Mr., 3254
May, Mr., 3254
Drainage, 3257
Moose Range, qu, 3144, 3259
Unorganized districts, 3258
Dwight, Mr. T. W., allowance, 4702
Estimates, 3406
Expenditure, 113
Forest reserves, roads and bridges, 1014
Fortier, Mrs. F. T. E., allowance, 4702
Homesteads, 3251
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Outside salaries, 3249
Rocky Mountain park
Claim of Hudson Bay company, qu. 2418
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Dominion Lands and Parks—*Con.*
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Unorganized districts, improvement, 3256
Wainwright buffalo reserve, 3407. *See also* Buffalo

Dominion Marine Association. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Power Board. *See* Water Powers

Dominion Textile Company. *See* Textiles

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B. *See* Public Archives

Douglas Credit Scheme. *See* Credits

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Downie, Mr. Donald. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Drain Tiles. *See* Taxation, Sales Tax

Drainage. *See* Dominion Lands, Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M. *See* Printing Bureau, King's Printer

Drawbacks. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 153. Speech of Mr. Meighen, 153, 154; sales tax; New York loans, 154-155; direct increase of Canada's obligations; surplus of previous years; railway expenditure, 155; Sir Henry Thornton and the railways; National railway board, 156; Intercolonial railway; Mr. D. B. Hanna, 157; Lanark election; domestic loan, 158; cost of placing loans in New York, 158-159; commissions on loans; increase in public expenditure, 159-160; Mr. Shaw's amendment, 160
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Department, salaries and contingencies, 610
Annuities, old age, 1696, 1698
Artificial silk industry, 2659, 2703, 2853. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Auditor General, vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4674
Automobile insurance, 3978
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314
Bank draft tax, 3925, 3928
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. 3097-3125, 3209-3222
Beet sugar duty, 2657, 2706, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597 4608
Board of Audit Act, 4355
Botany yarn duty, 3896
British Empire exhibition, 1910, 3949
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3458
Woollen goods, 3459
Budget
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1868 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Protective feature, 3468
Speech, 2657; congratulations to the Minister of Finance; Mr. Fielding's 17th budget; cigarette tax; beet sugar tax; French treaty; raisins and dried currants; tariff stability; United States prosperity, 2657; Canada, condition and prospects; financial situation; railways; debt; deficits; estimates for 1923-24; taxation, 2658; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty, 2659; trade and industry, 2701; comparison with other countries, finances; debt and deficits; budget; tariff, changes in; free trade, 2702; tariff stability; artificial silk industry; copper rods and bars, 2703; hemp bounty; silk; sales tax; cost of living, 2704; receipt tax, 2705; luxuries; cheque tax; income tax; cigarette tax; beet root sugar, 2706; confectionery and beverages; reciprocity with United States; potatoes, duty on; imports and exports, 2707; imports of agricultural products; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2708; copper bounty; hemp bounty; revenue and expenditure; deficits, 2709; French treaty; taxation of necessities instead of luxuries; political budget; government supporters appointed to Senate and Bench; jobs for political supporters; shipping rates; royal commissions, 2710; timber famine; amendment, opportunity for Progressive party to move, 2711
Reference to, 3074
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3439
Business of the House, 3127
Adjournments at 11 p.m., 1360
Bills, principle, on second reading, 3091

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Motion to increase taxation, 3936
Private members' day, 1161
Supply
Calling of, 2295
Undiscussed items not in official report, 3285
Business Profits War Tax bill, 4440, 4489
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada, constitutional development, 4466
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3146
Distressed seamen, 3969
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3814
Advances, 3814, 3824
Coal-carrying trade, 3826
Construction, 3814
Deficit, 3815
Sale of vessels, 3705, 3822
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3817
Canadian National Institute for blind, 694
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3441
Canadian National railways
Advances
$1,550,000, 4692
$73,000,000, 3789
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Col., reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-44
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4329, 4399
Finance, 4319, 4329
Comparison of votes, 1922 and 1923, 3702
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Deficits, 2658
Directors, Talbot, Col. O., 2004, 4525
Grand Trunk
Amalgamation, 56
Ocean ports, 1762
United States terminals, 815
Insurance of mortgaged premises, bill, 2048, 2107
Items, opportunity to discuss, 3703
Management, responsibility and powers, 3616, 3624
Ocean ports, 1759
Operating deficits, 3701
Orders in council, 815
Paris offices, 3611, 3660, 3683, 3701
Pre-audit, 3701
Robb, Mr., 2472
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Securities bill, 4515
Amdt. to refer back, neg. 4732

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Canadian National railways—*Con.*
Summary and allocation of vote, 3798
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, responsibility and powers, 3617, 3624
Toronto
Office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Viaduct and union station, 4445
Canadian ports, use of by United States fishermen, 3906
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Cheque tax, qu. 282, 332, 2706, 3925, 4409, 4423
Amendment, 3933
Enforcement, qu. 492
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Cigarettes
Consumption of, qu. 516
Duty, 2706, 3229, 4393
Civil government estimates, form of, 668
Civil Service, 1811
Bonus, 1811
Commission
Postmasters, appointments, 1821, 1823, 1827
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 350
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement bill, 3146
Combines bill, 2621-38, 2660-65
Civil Service Act appointments, 2662
Commissioners, appointments, 2627
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Coal, reported discovery in Ontario, 2512
Commercial union, 3906
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949, 4670
Confectionery and beverages, tax, qu. 624, 2707
Copper bounty, 2709, 3234, 4375
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287, 2288
Cory, Mr. W. W., Deputy Minister of the Interior, salary, 4667
Cost of living, Prof, Michell, figures, 1700
Credits, function, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 4408
Customs Tariff items
Artificial silk, 3489
Manufactures, 3492
Tops and waste of artificial fibre silk, 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Brass, iron or steel parts for umbrellas, 3501

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff items—*Con.*
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental purposes, 3483
Coverings and containers, 3501
Crude petroleum, 3481
Date when changes became effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Firebrick, 3482
Liquorice paste, 3480
Malt flour duty, 3480
Printing and lithographic presses, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 3477
Rolled iron and steel hoops, etc, 3484
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Wool, botany yarn, 3489
Deputy ministers, salaries
Deputy Minister of Finance, 4670
Increase in, 4667
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3988
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill (Coal lands) 3149
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3249
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dominion Power board, 3427
Dredging by government dredges, 4569, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt., 3980
Electric power, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 662
Emigration to the United States, 691, 2400
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Estimates
Arrangement of, 610, 668, 1468, 3242
Civil government, form of, 668
Discussion en bloc, 4559, 4588
Supplementary, time of presentation, 4554
Exchequer court judgeship, 2501
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927, 3938
Exhibitions, 1455
Collection of exhibits, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Experimental farms, 456
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
External Affairs department, salaries, 3897
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4406

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Finance department, charges of management, 3987
France, exports and imports, 2004. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1960, 2852
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1959
French treaty, 443, 456, 2002, 2255, 2299-2303
Agricultural imports, 445
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Border states, agreements and concessions, 2219, 2273, 2395
Brandies and wines, 444, 3478
French brandy, Scotch and Canadian whiskies, 3478
Bronze powder, 2002, 2006, 2270
Competition with United States, 443
Embroideries, 2008
Favoured nation, 443, 2271
Luxuries, 444
Sales tax, 2279, 2280, 2299
Silks and silk manufactures, 2255, 2264, 2300, 2397
Treaty of 1907, 2004
United States trade with France, 2277
Velvets, velveteens, etc. 3488
Wines, duty, 438, 444, 3478
Wool, 447
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 2105, 3150
Fuel supply, 802
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Government publications, 811, 1712
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Grain inquiry commission, appeal, 1210
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Halifax
Exodus from, 2400
Grain elevator, 4713
Historic events, grants for celebration, 4705
Harbours and rivers
Engineers' reports, 4571
Nova Scotia, 4562
Morrison claim, 4573, 4722
Ontario, 4589
Prince Edward island, 4587
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
"Hector" celebration, 4705
Hemp bounty, 2659, 2704, 2709, 3912
Highways, Ontario, cost of, 2490, 2493
Hoppe leases, 3128
Housing, loans to provinces, 4705
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4686-9
Icebreakers and steamers, 3160

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Immigration
Advertising, qu. 518, 1103
Black, Mr. W. J., 2084
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Salvation army and, 1093
Chinese, 1445, 1447, 2309
Detailed information, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 667, 1096, 1473, 1480
Estimates, arrangement of, 1468
Medical inspection, 702
Ratio of British to foreign, 1105
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement, 2795
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4495
Indians, 2124
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1361
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4393
Cigarettes and beet sugar duties, 3229
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Insulin, patenting of, 2077
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3147, 3978
Interim supply bills, 1482, 3705
Interior department, salaries, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, survey, 3247
International bridge at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2400, 2437
Concessions to border states, 2395
Consideration postponed, 2304
Jugo-Slavia, 2396
Silks, 2397
Johnston, Mr. Alex, salary increase, 4668
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Labour, strikes in, 1922, 495, 815
Lake Grain Rates commission, 4710
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, 3989
Linen yarn duty, 3897
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4576
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Marketing of imported goods, qu. 616, 931
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3317

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Marshall, Mr. Duncan—*Con.*
Salary, 608
Visit to Great Britain, 4675
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, speech in North Essex, 670
Michigan Central bridge, sales tax, qu. 1257
Military hospitals, 670
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975, 3977
Mines and Geological Survey
Estimates, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse, 4573, 4722
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 3149.
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2107, 2437
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3281
Newspaper postage, 4528
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4483
Nova Scotia
Disallowance of provincial legislation, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Miners' strike, 914
Northwest Territories Act, 270
Ontario legal fees, 1155
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2114, 3149
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Parliament buildings, 1716, 1719
Estimates, M. to reduce, 1727
Members' rooms, allocation, 1729
Tower, completion of, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Patents of Invention bill, 2064, 2071, 2083, 2088, 2102
Commissioner, powers of, 2065
Penitentiaries, 706
Pensions
Commissioners, 685
Federal appeal board and district boards of review, 403
Royal commission, expenses, 691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Petroleum bounties, 3921, 4392
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Postage stamps, use for revenue purposes, 1815, 3927, 3938
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Post Office department
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1822
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Postmaster General, illness, absence, 1821
Postmasters, appointment of, 1821-1827

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Post Office department—*Con.*
List of appointments, 1830
Revenue not connected with service, 1815
Rural mail service, Anderson, Mr., 1821
Prince Edward island, terminals claim, 4676
Printing bureau
New building, 1731
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Promissory notes tax, 3925
Provincial rights, bankruptcy, 3097
Public expenditure, 2658
Total $548,750,714, 4554
Public works estimates, 4554
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Purchasing Commission, 3950, 4002, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, 2285, 3337
Railway and shipping strikes, 245
Railway statistics, 207
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2705, 3934, 4423
Revision, 4409
Reciprocity with United States, 2707, 2708
Offer to negotiate, 3906
Redistribution, delay, 2400
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers, emigration, 691
Riordan Company, business tax, 4490
Rural credits, 645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
St. Lawrence river waterway, 663, 3427
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3339
Sales tax, qu. 281, 2704, 4409. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Collections, qu. 938
Exemptions, qu. 491, qu. 708
Imports, 4411
International bridge, Niagara Falls, material, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Jobber and retailer, 4411
Magazines and periodicals, 4416
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 919
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Senate, elective, M. (Mr. Denis) 1369
Shale deposits, maritime provinces, 2513
Silk. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk; Customs Tariff items; French treaty
Industry in Canada, 2397
Prices, 2397-2400
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference, 3012
Soldier Settlement Board; estimates, 1910
Soldiers, vocational training, 686
Spain, trade with, 2397

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4409. *See also under this title,* Sales tax
Steamship services, 4701
Tariff commission evidence, 2296
Tariff weapon, 3477. *See also* French Treaty
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Receipt tax; Sales tax
Direct results, qu. 281
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3963
Tinplate, 2400
Toronto
Canadian National railways office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Customs house, 3278
Harbour improvements, 4610
Union station, 4325, 4450
Viaduct, 4306, 4325, 4445, 4450
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2293
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270, 2301
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Signing of, 4466
With France and Italy, 9. *See also under this title,* French; Italian
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Unemployment relief, 689
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Tariff and emigration, 1092
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3234
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4726
War claims, adjustment, 2495, 2497, 2501
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3761
West Ukrainian republic, 657
Wheat shipments, Quebec, qu. 3820
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Excise tax on, 3937
Woollen imports, 3469
Woollen industry, protection, 931
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4682
Hudson Bay railway, 1062

Dredges and Dredging. *See* Harbours and Rivers; Marine and Fisheries; Public Works

Drugs. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Opium
Importation of. *See* Narcotic Drugs
Metagen, analysis of, qu. 1867
Scopolamin, 4647

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 2973; tariff; marking of woollen goods; protection fundamentally wrong; congratulations to Finance Minister; budget, violation of election pledges, 2973; tariff issue from 1878 to 1896; appropriation of protective policy by Liberals; Mr. Euler's statement on political platforms; political honour in jeopardy; Prime Minister's pre-election promises conditions unchanged and grievances unredressed; Conservative party, violation of pledges; Mr. Meighen on agricultural implement duties, 2974; "ramparts of gold"; duty increased by increase of price; protection and home markets; agricultural implement industry; duty payment of $265.80 per employee, 2975; Canadian National railways hotel deficits; Progressive party a "menacing enemy"; reasons for agricultural organizations, 2976
Sales tax on Union Jack, 4514
Woollen industry, protection, M. 928, 2973

Drury Government, expenditure and debt, 2824

Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 384, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705

Dry Docks
Esquimalt, 2671, 2682
Kingston, 4563
Vancouver and Victoria, 1002

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt Bill
(Ninety per cent of subsidy payable when seventy-five per cent of work completed). Res 3583, 3979; 1r., 2r., com., 3979; 3r., 3981

Dual Citizenship. *See* Naturalization

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address, 108. The late Hon. Mr. Kennedy; necessity for economy, 108; amendments of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hoey; the public debt, expenditure at Halifax and St. John, 109; Quebec and Toronto ports, expenditure; Pacific coast ports; naval expenditure during war, 110; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; immigration and emigration; railway freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement, 111-112; maritime provinces suffering by reason of high freight rates; United States tariff; tariff on fish, 112; national expendi-

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ture, necessity for reduction in militia estimate, 113; loan to Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 113-114; Purchasing Commission; international boat race, 114; votes for agriculture; Hudson Bay railway, 115; Mr. Meighen and the tariff, 116
Agriculture, expenditure on, 115, 117
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4158
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1542
Salmon canner's licenses, 1547
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coasting regulations, 4235
Distressed seamen, 3970
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 111
Advances, 113, 3377, 3799
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3396
Operating deficit, 3843
Sale of vessels, 3813
West Indies, trade, 3387, 3808
Fish and fisheries
French treaty, canned fish, 452
Sardine fishery, 2518
Tariff on fish, 2518
Trout fishing season, 1686
Grondines wharf, 960
Halibut fishery treaty, signing of, 858
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 942
Hudson Bay railway, 115
M. (Mr. Knox) 1042
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4223-34, 4283, 4293
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3352
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Marine and Fisheries
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Deputy minister's salary, 3373
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Naval service, 905
Royal Canadian Volunteer reserve, 2897
Royal Canadian navy, 905
Nova Scotia
Harbours and rivers, 942
Miners' strike, use of troops, 897
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
Steamship services.
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that head under this title*
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3387

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Thornton, Sir Henry, director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3845
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trout-fishing season, 1686

Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations to, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Dun, R. G. & Co., cost of living, 1812

Duncan, Mr. M. R. (North Grey)
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283
Malone, Late Lieut-Col. W. P., qu. 206
P. C. 1053, qu. 516

Duncan, Mr. Walter, 1140

Dunning, Premier of Saskatchewan
Budget, 2872

Duties. *See* Customs

East, crisis in. *See* Near East Crisis

East Edmonton District
Res. on immigration, 81
United Farmers of Alberta, 107

East Templeton, Que., wharf, 955

Easter adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Galicia. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Eastern Lands Development Company, 626, 1635

Eastern Situation. *See* Near East Crisis

Eaton, T. Company
Comparison of prices with Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, 2739, 2742

Economic Conditions, 1238, 1250, 1393. *See also* Agriculture, Agricultural Conditions; Banks and Banking; speeches on Address, and Budget
Canadian affected by European, 3003
Cost of living and, 1684, 1811-14. *See also that title*
Cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Economic group organizations, 3002
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Immigration and, 1231. *See also that title*
Improvement, 3055
Effected by railways, 1566
Tariff, 3053
Wealth, production of, 1856
Western provinces, 1883. *See also that title*

Economic Conference. *See* Imperial Economic Conference

Economy. *See* Government; Immigration; Public Expenditure

Editorial Committee
Abolition, 1714
Cost, 1669
King's Printer, 1669
Members of, and staff, 1675
Publications, unnecessary duplication, 1714
Saving effected by, 1670
French publications, 1670
Translation and printing, 1489

Edmonton. *See also* East Edmonton
Board of Trade res. on coal duty, 1275
Grain elevator, 4716
Indian school, 2149, 2164-5
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Post Office, theft of $50,000 from, 1142
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506

Edmundston, N.B.
Bridge, 1014, 2342, 4589
Public building, 4613

Education. *See also* Schools; Universities
Capitalistic control of educational agencies, 2725
Cost of, 2732
Foreigners, opportunities, 1885
Indians. *See that title.*
International Scholarships, 878
Jurisdiction, 882, 1884-5
Opportunities, 2831
School lands. *See also* Dominion Lands
Schools closed on account of financial stringency, 1202
Technical Education Act, 1637

Eggs
Egg-grading plants. *See* Live Stock Acts
Freight rates, 1962
French treaty, export, 1978
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
From United States, 2708, 2821
Inspector, Yukon territory, qu. 2516
Prices, 1841, 1851, 1852

Egypt, British policy in, 4662

Eight Hour Day. *See* Labour

Elections. *See also* Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation
By-elections. *See also* House of Commons
Grenville, 4606
Handwriting on the wall, 2981

Elections—*Con.*
By-elections—*Con.*
Lanark, 157
Moose Jaw
Certificate of Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Oleomargarine, 3526
Reported statement, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 1686, 2774, 4683
North Essex, 2013, 2469, 4594, 4606
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2013, 2245
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr.
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2245
Visit to Belle River, 4594
Election of 1896, 3014
Election of 1921. *See also* Liberal Party
King, Right Hon. Mackenzie, speeches, 3047
Policy proclaimed but forgotten, 1426
Statements and prophecies, 1658
Violation of election pledges, 2973, 3189
Multi-member constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation
Ontario. *See also* Ontario
Issue in, 1420
Proportional representation. *See that title*
Revelstoke and Nelson, bribery, 2941

Elective Senate. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Electoral Reforms. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Lines, sale of. See Canadian National Railways

Electric Power. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Exportation to United States, 1266
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 658, withdrawn, 666
Export duty, 2828
Power development, St. Lawrence river. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal

Electricity
Electrical apparatus, import. *See* French Treaty
House heating by, 3425

Electrification. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Elevators. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Elliott, Mr. Preston (Dundas)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3523

Elliott, Mr. William (Waterloo)
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Rural mail carriers, qu. 1259, 1783
Sales tax, 4422
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207

Elmira-Souris railway, 129

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Cattle

Emigration. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration
Doukhobors, 43
Emigration to the United States, 21, 67, 77, 628, 637, 1082, 1093, 1109, 1113, 1128, 1165, 1173, 1178, 1188, 1198, 1206, 1217, 1235, 1241, 1244, 1253, 1319, 1322, 1330, 1338, 1389, 1392, 1403, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1439, 1845, 1888, 1892, 2400, 2650, 2715, 2743, 2822, 2929, 2970, 3191, 4064. *See also* Taxation
American publications, effect on, 831
Canadians returning, 2743
Causes, 2747, 3004
Climate, 2747
Cost of living, 2790. *See also that title*
Economic conditions, 2727
Taxation, 1319, 2709, 2747
Unemployment and, 1657
Figures, 1917-22, 1093
Halifax, exodus from, 2400
Information bureau to ascertain reason for, 2932
Labouring people, 2727. *See also* Labour
Lumber camps from, to New England States, 1125
Montreal, from, 2216, 2790
Returned soldiers, 691
Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1188
Skilled workmen, 2823
Montreal, from, 2790
Tariff and, 2737. *See also* speeches on Budget
University graduates, 2732
Windsor, Canadians crossing border, 1431
Winnipeg, from, 1975
Winnipeg Free Press, statement, 2790
Young men, 2816
Mennonites, 43, 1239, 1341, 1884
Mexico, to, 1229

Empire Day Ajournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Empire Forestry Conference, 3410

Empire Settlement Scheme. *See* Immigration

Employers' Liability Compensation

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Alien Property. *See* Aliens

Enemy Aliens. *See this title under* Aliens

Engineering Standards. *See* Canadian Engineering

England. *See* Great Britain

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Equalization of Railway Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Eskimos, Trial of. *See* Justice

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt
Dry dock, 2671
Graving dock, 2682
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634

Essex By-Election. *See* Elections, North Essex

Estevan Board of Trade, Hudson Bay railway, 1079

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply
For departments, *see their titles*
Appropriations for railway subsidies, 4521
"Appropriations not required" 1656
Arrangement of, 1468
Canadian National railway expenditure, 4304
Civil government, form of, 610, 668, 780
Discussion
En bloc, 4554, 4558, 4612, 4587
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614, 4615
Expenditure provided for, 4554
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations
Maturing, 1753
To be incurred, 1753
One-sixth vote for 1923-4, 1482, 1538
Preparation, 2756, 3242
Supplementary
For 1923-4, 1359, 1659, 4536
Further supplementary, 4392, 4536
Lack of information, 4576, 4577
Time of presentation, 4554, 4577, 4594, 4601, 4703, 4420, 4422
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report, 3284

Euclid Hall. *See* Military Hospitals

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 2852. Congratulations to Finance Minister; a unique record; criticism of budget; national viewpoint; Canada a hard country to govern; diversified interests make compromise necessary; Liberal tariff platform of 1919, 2852; little confidence in political platforms; artificial and natural silk industries; taxation of luxuries; speech of Mr. Forke; tariff stability; opinion of Mr. H. W. Wood, Alberta; dependence of industry upon agriculture, 2853; difficulties of manufacturers; free trade not possible; tariff for revenue and protection; effect upon consumer; amendment; free trade with England; British preference; reciprocity; charge that government has done nothing for the farmer; Crowsnest pass agreement 2854; claim of Progressives that they forced concession; the two old parties; "holier than thou" attitude of some members; allegation that parties take orders from big interests, 2855; no election contributions; leader of the Government; speech on budget, in 1921; moderate tariff; lack of markets; United States markets, competition of Canadian manufacturers in; United States tariff against Canadian goods, 2856; revenue; tariff reduction; taxation; Canadian farmer a free trader; United States farmer a protectionist; Wheat Board; free trade in raw materials; importance of tariff question magnified; income and luxury taxes, economy; Civil Service; taxation rescinded; system should be carefully worked out; stamp tax; receipt tax; irritating excise tax; cheque tax, 2858; difficulties of collection; public irritation and inconvenience; basic methods of taxation; tariff, income and turnover; sales tax; Canadian National railways; public ownership; revaluation, 2859
Budget speech, reference to, 3070
Buttons, importation, 2214
Canadian National railways
Fixed charges, qu. 708
Public ownership, 2859
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 373
Eastern Canada, conditions, 1222
Free trade, 2466, 2858

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Immigration
Policy, 1220
Attitude of labour towards, 1224
Labour Gazette, 1627
Liberal platform of 1919, 2852, 3019
Repudiation of, 2994, 3019
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2190, 2444-67
Denaturalization, 2465
Judges, 2466
Nationality, dual, 2444, 2464
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3521
Political platforms, 2853, 2974, 2991
Reference to, 2852, 2974
Sales tax, raw materials, 4421
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4421
Tariff and immigration, 1222
Western provinces, conditions in, 1221

Europe. *See also* Immigration
Agricultural products, inability to buy, 3004
Coal supplies, 1263
Conditions
Chaotic, 2748
Economic, 3003
Unsettled, 3052
Purchasing power, decrease, 1859
Southeastern, immigration from, 1195
Wheat prices, 3004

European War. *See* Pensions; War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address in reply, 144. Agriculture the basis of national prosperity; tariff system, 144; anti-combine legislation; customs, valuation for duty, 145; the Tariff Act; protection on flour, 146; dissatisfaction with economic situation in West; British Columbia apples, handling of, 147; class legislation; embargo on cattle, 148; automobiles in Saskatchewan; Crowsnest pass agreement and freight rates, 149
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4046, 4137
Bounties, principle of, 3242
British preference, direct importation, 3451
Budget, 3067. Trade issue; secession talk, 3067; abandonment of free trade by Liberal party; speech of Prime Minister; tariff stability; taxation, burden of; capital; theory and method; venerable protectionist arguments; prices of manufactured and agricultural products; British preference; Canadian ports; 3068; raisins and currants duty; artificial silk duty; copper

Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
bounty; sugar duty; permanent tariff commission; "scientific" tariff protection; class privilege; taxation, passing on; farm products and world conditions; United States farmers and Fordney tariff, 3069; Progressive party, criticism of; discrimination between city and rural dwellers; rural mail carriers remuneration; speech of Mr. Euler; concessions to manufacturers; old parties and big interests; Sir Richard Cartwright on protection; protection, money and moral cost of, 3070; political corruption; legalized robbery; Goldwin Smith; farming methods; paternalism; "Canada for the Canadians;" interest of common people in government, 3071; free trade England; tariff and deficit of Canadian Government Merchant Marine; exodus to other countries; British national debt decreasing, Canadian national debt increasing; bonussed industries; tariff inconsistencies; dumping clause; revenue; combines, 3072; taxation; co-operative purchasing and selling; cost of living; income tax; inheritance tax; luxuries, taxation of; economy; inopportune expenditures; Welland canal; "blind selfishness;" Hudson Bay railway, 3073; Canada hard country to govern; independence not vital; newspaper control; confidence destroyed; class privilege, 3074
Canada Grain Act, administration, 786
Canadian Pacific freight rates and dividends, 1134
Combines bill, 2533
Consumption of intoxicants, qu. 285
Copper bounty, 3069, 3242, 4371
Deportation of British soldier, 2254
Esquimalt navy yard, qu. 1634
Experimental farms, 4632
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4346
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Freight rates, increase, 1134
Geodetic survey, 3245
Grain dockages and screenings, 786
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 941
Hemp bounty bill, 4381, 4384
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Hudson Bay railway lands, qu, 2393
Immigration policy, 1133
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Income tax, 4501
Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Indians, 2145, 2147
Reserves, grain production, qu. 1139
Iron and steel bounties, 4381
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4293
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837, 841
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 295
Oleomargarine, import of materials, qu. 3505
Pulpwood, export of, 4346
Qu'Appelle-Battleford telegraph line, 1017
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 744
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3069, 3476
Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 3070, 3076
Shipping combines, 1134
Steamship service, Canada-West Indies, qu. 937
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2683
Topographical surveys, 3245
Woollen industry, 3461

Everett, Mr. Howard. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization

Evidence in Marriage and Divorce Proceedings. *See* Criminal Code Admt. bill

Ewart, Mr. J. S., K.C., Canada's relations with Empire, 314, 1529

Examinations of Masters and Mates. *See* Marine

Exchange. *See also* Great Britain; Finance
Medium of. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Rate, franc, value of, 2009
Unfavourable, 2912

Exchequer Court of Canada
Alien enemy property, 2499
Audette, Mr. Justice, 2502
Judgeship, 2499
War claims, competency to deal with. *See* War Claims

Excise Taxes. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Excursion Tickets, qu. 1485

Executions, public. *See* Capital Punishment

Exemptions. *See* Civil Service; Income Tax; Taxation

Exhibitions. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade
Agricultural fairs, horse-racing, 726, 750
Atlanta, 1465
Belgian, 496, 1467
British Empire, 463, 1454, 1873, 1910, 3949, 4704
Yukon mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Brussels, 1467
Canadian, travelling in France, 811, 1457, 4711
Chicago, 1454, 1466
Fat Stock Show, 1398
Collection of samples for exhibits, 1468
Commercial, 1467
Des Moines, 1466
Estimates, 1454, 1465
Expenditure in Great Britain and United States, 1465-68
Great Britain, 1467
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1454
Maple products, Beauceville, 1810
Royal Show, 1454
St. Petersburg, 1465
Seattle, 1467
Seed and field competitions, 599
Southern States in, 1465
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1467
Staff and salaries, 1455
Tampa, Florida, 1454, 1465
United States in, 1465

Exhibits. *See* Exhibitions

Exodus to United States. *See* Emigration

Expenditure. *See* Public Expenditure

Experimental Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explorations, Arctic, 3944. *See also* Arctic

Explosives. *See* Mines and Minerals

Export Duty. *See* Customs and Excise

Export Act Amdt. Bill (Pulpwood, prohibition, of export) Res. 4012, 4345; 1r., 4355; 2r., com., 4393; 3r., amdt. (Mr. Power), six months' hoist, 4397, neg. on div., 3r., 4397

Exporters' Association. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Exports. *See* Imports and Exports

Express Charges, 2876. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific

Express Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways

External Affairs, Department of
Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988
Employees and cost, 2970
Pope, Sir Joseph, salary, 3988, 4671
Salaries, 3987

Factory and Shop Acts of British Dominions, 1443

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Eggs, price of, 1852
Geodetic survey, expenditure, qu. 1634
L'Islet wharf, 969
Surveys in prairie provinces, qu. 1866
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865

Failures. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

False Creek Bridge, 3375, 4708

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Crude petroleum bounty, qu. 3262
Customs drawbacks, qu. 1484
Raw materials imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259, qu. 1864
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3358
Oil Springs postmaster, qu. 518

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Products. *See* Agriculture

Farmer, Mayor S. J., Winnipeg. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Farmers. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget; Immigration; Taxation
Advice to, 2953
Allegation that government has done nothing for, 2854
Bank shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Bankruptcy Act Amdt., farmers, 3211
Banks, treatment by, 2929. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Burdens of, 2731
Canadian farmer, free-trader, United States protectionist, 2857
City man and, 2869
Comparison with other countries, 2791
Conditions. *See* Agriculture; Immigration
Debts, 1407, 1412, 2768
Earnings, 2813, 3023
Extravagance, 1888
Farmers' Bloc in United States, 2791
Farmers' movement, 2884
World wide, 2791
Farmers' party. *See* Progressive party
Hard times, 1859
Help for needy, 1404

Farmers—*Con.*
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1419. *See also* Immigration
Improvident methods, 1423
Income tax and, qu. 1259, qu. 1486
Industries dependent on prosperity of, 2853
Labour. *See that title*
Manufacturers and, 2716
Market, lack of, 2856
National Farmers' Union of England, 2791
National Policy, 2917. *See also* speeches on Budget
Non-continuous employment, 1888
Organizations, 2815
Future of, 2792
Parliament, in, 2787
Profits, 2873
Pulpwood, export of, 4513. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Purchasing power, 1408, 1851
Reciprocity and, 2924. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2731, 2916, 3066. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxes, 4224. *See also* Taxation
United Farmers of Ontario, 4608
Work, 1852

Farms
Abandoned, 67. *See also* Address; Immigration; Lands; School.
Credits. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits

Favoured Nation. *See* Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Feathers and Ornaments. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* Jurisdiction; Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Federal Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1621

Federal Representation. *See* Redistribution

Federal Statutes, enforcement, 1142

Federation of Canadian Students. *See* Students

Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill; Grain and Grain Trade
Adulteration, 600, 604
Conference of producers and handlers, 600-4
Control, 599
Milled, mixing with bran and shorts, 600
Screenings, 2039. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill
(Regulation of preparation and sale of milling by-products) Res., 4012, 4270, 4272; 1r., 2r., com., 4276; com., 4538; 3r., 4553

Fenian Raid. *See* Pensions

Fertilizers
Administration of Act, 601
Control, 599
Duty, 3486
Fish waste, manufacture into, 2946
Machinery for, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Nitrate of soda, 2307

Feudal System. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Fiats, Issuing of. *See* Petition of Right Act

Field Crops. *See* Agriculture

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Acknowledgment of congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Address in reply 89. Mr. Meighen on the tariff; valuation of goods for customs duties, 90; causes of increase in national debt, 91; railways, cost of taking over, 91-93; national ownership expensive; increase in obligations to United States, 93; loans and interest; money borrowed cheaper from United States, 94; late government's borrowings from United States; Mr. Meighen on sales tax, 94; amendments moved by Progressives; resolution of Liberals in 1921; downward revision of tariff, 96; French treaty, 97; wise expenditure true economy, 97-98; business of country cannot be carried on without increase in public debt, 98; amendments not acceptable to government, 99
Agricultural conditions, Great Britain, 1861
Annuities, old age, basis of computation, 1698
Artificial silk, duty. *See under this title* Customs Tariff Items
Auditor General
Office, salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Report, 434
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4513
Automobiles
Duty, 3075
Insurance 3147, 3977

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1157, 1310, 4013, 4017, 4075, 4078-4131, 4133-4162
Extension of charters for one year, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Government inspection, 1310
Mortgages or hypothecs, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4133
One vote for each share, 4085
Postponement, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Senate amendments, 4508
Bank Act revision
Inquiry, 255, 496, 644, 858
Res. of Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank draft tax, 3928
Bank mergers, 4134, 4139
Banking and Commerce Com. changes, 2926
Beet sugar excise duty, 2644, 3229, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597
Binder twine, duty and manufacture, 3231, 4388
Board of Audit Act, 4355, 4369, 4733
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference, 3454. *See also under this title,* Budget
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 3454, 3895
Goods via Hong Kong and Suez canal, 3455
Increase in, 3488
Liberal convention of 1919, 454
Woollen industry, 3459, 3472
Budget
Date of
Announcement, 2469
Inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Debate, precedence, 2694
Record established, 2852
Resolutions, changes, notice, 3046, 4163
Speech, 2640. Finances, income and expenditure over ordinary capital and special expenditure, 2640; advances to Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine; public debt, addition to; expenditure and taxation; additions to debt diminishing; increase since 1914, 2641; estimate of revenue and expenditure for 1923-24; loans, tax reductions, 2642; sales tax, complexity of; imposition of six per cent tax at source; exemptions from, additions to list of, 2643; receipt tax; cheque tax; French Treaty; Canadian wines, duty on; French brandy, 2643; income tax;

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
cigarette duty; beet root sugar; raisins and dried currants; petroleum, 2644; iron and steel scrap; boots or other appliances for deformities; casual donations; machinery; hemp seed; machinery for conversion or fish waste; oil-drilling machinery; stumping machinery; malt flour; printing machinery; artificial silk; British preferential tariff; direct importation through Canadian ports; sugar duties; 2645 sugar, increase in price; speculation; reduction in duty; dumping clause; copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646; bounty on hemp; linen thread bounty; manila hemp bounty, 2647; petroleum bounty; forest conservation; pulpwood; prohibition of export, royal commission; tariff stability; finality, 2648; relations with United States; Fordney-McCumber tariff; offer of reciprocity; reduction of duties by order in council, 2649; the outlook; trade revival in United States; labour, unemployment; prospects of a return of prosperity, 2650; tariff resolutions, 2650
Supplementary statement, 3074. Appreciation of personal references; speech of Sir Henry Drayton; estimates; revenue, estimate of; tariff weapon in trade negotiations with foreign countries, 3074; France and United States; "no truck nor trade with the Yankees"; automobiles; potatoes; artificial silk duty, 3075; economy; expenditures suggested by Opposition; militia; naval service; bounties; Toronto harbour; St. Lawrence waterway; rural mail carriers; Progressive members and expenditure; Hudson Bay railway; civil service; public works, 3076; protectionist budget; tariff reductions; amendment; speech of leader of Opposition; budget, form of; brevity, 3077; "jacking-up" tariff; financial difficulty due to war and railways; responsibility for; budget, balancing of; new taxation; sales tax; public debt, additions to; reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3078; possible United States view; reciprocity agreement of 1911; permanency, attitude of United States towards, 3079; position of Conservative party in 1911 and at present time; "no truck or

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
trade with the Yankees", authority for phase, 3080; letter of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson to United States Secretary of State; clear-cut issue; Conservative party against trade with the United States; Liberal party stands for reciprocity; defeat of reciprocity agreement in 1911; sentiment towards question to-day, 3081; budget proposals; no new taxes; tariff reduction; British preference; sugar duty; Canadian ports; simplification of sales tax; reception of budget by country, 3082
Statements omitted, presented, 2926
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Adjournment, hour of, 3208
Budget resolutions, proceeding with, 4163
M. anticipating matter appointed for consideration 3327
M. to increase taxation, 3934, 3936
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Proceeding, 3127
Questions
Answers to, 343
Framing of, 1386
Passed as orders for returns, 939
Resolutions, unusual to call for explanation, 3583
Returns, inquiries for, 2208, 2254
Cattle embargo correspondence, 4295
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com., 857, 1300
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4076
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1300
Calling of, 2295
Business profits tax
Arrears, 4491
Collections, 1157
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4440, 4489
Canadian National railways
Advance, $13,099,493.34, 1752
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-37
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4337, 4398
Finance, 4329
Ocean ports, 1758
Paris offices, 3614
Securities bill, 4012, 4402, 4516, 4732
Expenditure to be voted by Parliament, amdt. (Mr. Meighen) 4527
Responsibility of government, 4696
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games 4707

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184, 4295
Cheque tax, 332, 2643, 3922, 3925, 3931, 4423
Cigarette duty, 2644, 3229, 4392
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Superannuation, 3402
Calder Act, 3266
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, 2926, 3146
Clair-Fort Kent bridge, 4590
Commercial union, 3909
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Concurrence, 4735
Interim supply, 1482
Confectionery and beverages, tax, 2644, 2656, 3046
Congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4742
Consumer, taxation and, 4415
Copper bounty, 2646
Bill, 4369, 4370, 4374, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4370
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister of Interior, salary, 4667
Credit and Industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 644
Amdt. ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 645
Criticisms of foreign budgets, 2804
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 2650, 3963, 4408
Customs Tariff items, 3895. *See also under this title,* Budget
Artificial silk, 2645, 3075, 3489
Drawback, 3502
Fabrics, 3492
Tops or waste 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493, 3495
Composition and plated metals, 3483
Coverings for goods and machinery, 3501
Crude petroleum, 2648, 2644, 3481
Date when changes effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Hatters sweats, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 3502
Dry red lead, etc. 3480
Fire-brick, 3481, 3896
Hemp seed, 2645, 3474
Liquorice paste, 3480
Machinery for manufacture of fish waste, 2645, 3486

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff—*Con.*
Printing and lithographing presses, **2645,** 3486
Raisins and dried currants, **2644, 3474**
Rolled iron and steel, 3484
Silk cloth woven in the gum, **3489**
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 2645, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Typewriters and parts, 3485
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dredging, government dredges, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates. *See also under this title,* Supply
Civil government, form of, 612
Further supplementary, **1923-4, 3492**
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations maturing, 1753
Preparation of, 3244
Supplementary, 1923-24
Tabled, 3492, 4536
Time of presentation, 4554
Time of presentation, 4420, 4597, 4601
Experimental farms, 486
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4345, **4393.** *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Fertilizers, duty, 3486
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill 255, 4405
Finance dept., charges of management, **3987**
Forest protection and conservation, **2648.** *See also under this title,* Export Act; Pulpwood
M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
France
Exports to, 1997
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Trade with, 1990, 1995, 1999
French treaty, 331, 436, 456, 1977, 1990, **2815**
Brandy, 2302, 3478
Bronze powder 1998, 2016, 2270
Canned salmon and lobster, 453
Concessions to border states, 440, **2273**
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Direct importation, 2303
Favoured nation, 448, 2271, 2398
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Luxuries, 446
Machinery and parts, 441
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2260
Sales tax and, 2279, 2280, 2299

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Silks, 448, 2266, 2301, 2398
Tabled, 54
Unfair competition, 2300
United States
Preferential treatment 440, 442
Trade with France, 2277
Wines, 1997, 3937
French treaty bill, 2238, 2255-80, 2299-2304, 2347
M. for 2r., 1910, 1990-95
Grants for historical celebrations, 4705
Halibut fishery treaty, 734, 857
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Hemp bounty, 2647
Bill, 3911, 3963, 4376, 4388
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigrants complaints of, 3598
Income tax, **1157, 2644**
Agricultural forms, 4498
Exemption for children, 4503
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1384
Fines, qu. 2180
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4492
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, **4360**
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. **2655, 3229, 4392**
Cigarettes, 3229
Insurance Act Amdt. **3045, 3147, 3977, 4357**
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interim supply bills. *See under this title,* Supply
Italian treaty, 331
Signature, 2403
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2404
Concessions to border states 2395
Consideration postponed 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401
Favoured nation treatment, 2398
Lapointe Mr., visit to Washington, 734, 857
League of Nations
Canada's contribution 3990
Canadian delegation, expenses, 3989
Legislation. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Hasty, 1376
Indemnity, etc., 4674
Liberal platform of 1919, not bound by, 2994, 3020
Library, joint committee, 615
Linen yarn
Bounty, 2648
Duty 3897, 3899
Little Anse breakwater, **Morrison claim, 4575**
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4577

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Malt flour, duty, 2645, 3480
Manila fibre bill, 2657, 3231, 4369
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, cattle embargo, 3317
Merchants' Bank. *See also under this title,* Bank Act Amdt.
Failure, 4155
Inquiry, expenses, 3990
Ministers and officials, travels, 343
National Gallery, 1019
Naturalization Act M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4372
North Essex election, 2013
Nova Scotia steel bounties, 4371
Oleomargarine
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials used, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3530, 3561
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3571
Orders in Council, repeal by statute, 3504
Parliamentary restaurant, com., 382
Penny Bank of Toronto, 1739, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866, 4749
Pensions
Old age, inquiry, 733
Pension Board, Colonel Thompson, 4749
Senators, to, 1376
Petroleum Bounties bill, 2657, 3920, 3963, 4392
Postage stamps used for revenue purposes, 3927, 3938
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Promissory notes, 3924
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389
M. (Mr. Good) 413
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, new departmental, 1730
Public debt. *See also under this title,* Budget
Additions to, 2642, 3078
Maturing obligations, 3823
Statement, 2926
Public expenditure, 2641, 4422, 4554
Apportionment of, 4560
Public Service Retirement Act, 3323, 3402
Calder Act, 3977
Public Works estimates, 4554

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Publicity agent in London, Mr. Cranfield, 2927
Pulpwood prohibition of export, 2648, 4012, 4345, 4393
Royal commission, 2648, 4709
Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4183, 4392
Railway subsidies, 4304
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 2644
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474
Receipt tax, 2644, 3935, 4423
Revision of, 4409
Reciprocity with United States
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3075, 3080
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 3454, 3474, 3901, 3903, 3907
Permanency, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 3079, 3905
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, 733
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal commission on lake grain rates, 2927
Rules of the House. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Sales tax, 3078, 4181, 4409, 4419. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Articles used by hospitals, 4432
Complexity of, 2643
Exemptions, 2643, 4431
Imports, 4409
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 919
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Public libraries, 1871
Six per cent, imposition at source, 2643
Union Jack, 4515
Select standing committees, membership, 382, 615, 2252
Senate
Abolition of, 1376
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1375
Senators, pensions to, 1376
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184
Special War Revenue Act 1915 Amdt. bill 2657, 4363, 4409
Cheque tax, 3922
Sales tax, 4181. *See also under this title,* Sales Tax
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Wines, excise tax on, 3937
Sugar duties, 2645, 3082, 3479
Beet root sugar, 2644, 3229, 4393
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4320

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Supply. *See also under this title,* Business of the House; Estimates
Bills, 4735
Interim supply, one-sixth vote, 1482, 1538, 3705
Committee, notice, 179
Concurrence, 4732
Tariff. *See also under this item,* Budget speech; Customs Tariff items
Amendments of 1920 and 1921, 3020
Attitude on, 2838
Changes proposed, 2651, 3462, 3895
Commission, evidence, 2296
Resolutions, 2650, 3963
Stability and finality, 2648
Weapon, 3074, 3477
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement on immigration, 2795
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Trade, 437
Union bank, position of, 4298
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Trade with France, 1991, 1997. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3233
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183, 811
War claims, Vickers company contract, 1746-7
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Ways and Means committee, 2640
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Wheat board legislation, 2928
Wines. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Canadian, duty on, 2643
Tax on, 3937
Woollen industry, 447, 3459, 3472

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1848

Finance. *See also* Bank Act Amdt bill; Banks and Banking; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Credits; Loans; Public Debt; Public Expenditure
Amortization plan, 2930
Bonds
Guaranteeing. *See* Canadian National Railways
Interest rate and income tax, 4494
Tax-free, qu. 342, 2914

Finance—*Con.*
British debt to United States, 2878
Dollar reserve in Canada, 2879
Canadian National Railways, securities, approval, 4402. *See also that title*
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739
Complicated and confused, 2915
Credit control, 631. *See also* Credits
Department
Boville, Mr. T. C., service and retirement. qu. 3135
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4670
Estimates, 3987
Distress in West, 1890. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Dividends
Taxation of, 281
Watered stock, 2956
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Financial and class rule in politics, 2733
Financial conditions, analysis, 2984
Financial control of government, 2812
Industry and, 4053
Interest rate, 2812. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
New York loans, 154, 155, 2963
Saskatchewan debentures, sale of, 2770
Securities, on which advances made to banks, 4405
Shares, issue of. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
World conditions, 2823, 2878

Finance Act 1914 Amdt. Bill, 255
(Advances to banks, bank payments in notes instead of gold or Dominion notes; export of gold, etc.) Res. 4249, 4405, 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4408

Financial Post, statement as to labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125

Financial Situation, 2658. *See* speeches on Address; Bank Act Amdt bill; Budget; Immigration

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2883. Long speeches; a budget Conservatives cannot find fault with; Liberal principles, 2883; tariff proposals; amendment; tariff reduction; disappointed hopes; farmers' movement; return to flesh-pots; member for Muskoka; disappointment with budget; 2884; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of, 2885

Finger Prints, offenders against Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136

Finland, immigration from, 1085

Finn, Mr. Robert E. (Halifax)
Canadian National railways, terminals, 4716
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 4678
Halifax grain elevator, 4715
Introduced, 3
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4678

Fire Brick. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Fire Prevention. *See* Forests and Forestry
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget

Fiset, Sir Eugene. *See* National Defence

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Asiatics engaged in, 1453, 1540-1, 1555, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484-5
Naturalization, 2461
Atlantic fisheries, inquiry into, 2983, 3084, 3365
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Behring sea, 4485
Bounties, report, 911
British Columbia, 3372
Fisheries Commission, 1453
Fishing licenses, 1540
Japanese fishermen, naturalization certificates, 1899, 2443
Canadian ports use of by United States fishermen, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Canned lobster and salmon, French treaty, 452
Canned salmon shipped via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Cold storage, 2056
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 3364, 3365
Express rates, 3365
Fish
Cooking, 3366
Culture, 3367
Demand for, 3364
Inspection Act, enforcement, 3367
Preserved, 1984. *See also* French Treaty
Products, imports, 445, qu. 617
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Russel, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Fishery protection service, 3361
United States steamer captured by Malaspina, 2207

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishing industry, difficulties and handicaps, 2945, 2972, 3002
Fishing interests and reciprocity, 3082
Fishing schooner race, 114, 115, 906
Fishways
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Salmon River, N.B., 3362
White Mud river, 3362
Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent, 1548
Freight rates, 1953, 1964, 2946
French treaty, 1978, 2235
Halibut, 151
Close season, 4480
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries. *See that title*
Treaty, 857, 858, 4132, 4440, 4437, 4664, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Signing of, 734
Hudson Bay, 1064, 1073. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
International Fisheries Commission, 4480
Japanese fishermen, 1453, 1540-1, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484, 4485
Japanese fisheries association, 1453
Licenses, reduction of 40 per cent, 1540-1
Lobster season, extension of, 2983, 3084
Machinery for conversion of fish offal into fertilizer, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine and Fisheries Committee
Reports presented
First, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983
Markets, 2906
Miramichi smelt fishing, qu. 1974
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Moving pictures, 3365
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Orientals engaged in. *See under this title,* Asiatics; Japanese
Pacific coast, 2734
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Publicity, 3364
Reciprocity, 3906. *See also that title*
Rivers and streams, sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Russel, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868
Salmon canners' licenses, 1540. *See also* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill
Salmon fisheries, Fraser river, 4461
Sardine fishery, 2518
Smelt, regulations, qu. 1868, qu. 1974

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Steveston Fishermen's Benovolent Society, 1900
Tariff on fish, 112-113
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Trout-fishing season, 1686
United States
Fishing vessels, licenses, 911
Markets, 2906
Modus vivendi. *See under this title,* Modus Vivendi
Tariff, 2734, 2940
Schooner, capture of, 2207

Fisher, Prof. Irving, purchasing power, 4666

Fisher, the late Hon. Sydney, 2057
Copyright Act, 2140

Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. Bill (Salmon canners' licenses) 1r., 4009; 2r., com., 3r., 4207

Fisheries Commission. *See* British Columbia

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Fishing Schooner Race, 114, 115, 906

Flags, Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Flathead District highway, qu. 2085

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 157, 1612

Flax. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Linen

Fleming, Sir Sandford, port of Shippegan, 2938

Flexner, Dr., discovery of serum for spinal menengitis, 1287

Flour. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade,
Freight rates, 1914, 2127
French treaty, 1978
Malt flour, duty, 3480
Milling in bond, 2960
Ocean rates, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906 2761
Prices in Canada and Great Britain, 1906
Protection, 146-147
Reciprocity in, 2993
Shipments
Canadian and United States ports through, 1767
China, to, 1840
Transportation, earnings of railways, 2960

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Budget, 2814. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public debt; war scandals; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; progress and prosperity, 2814; Borden-Meighen administration; speculation and profiteering; origin of farmers and labour party; democratic policy of

Fontaine, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
present administration; agriculture, condition and encouragement of; French and Italian treaties; Australia, trade agreement with; Turkey, threatened war with; Canada's participation, 2815; financial conditions; economy; European affairs; Canadian policy; immigration policy; emigration to the United States; protection of Canadian labour; Georgian Bay canal; Civil Service Commission, unconstitutionality of; patronage, 2816; dismissals and appointments after 1911; classification; the Griffenhagens; old age pensions; amendment, Mr. Forke; western provinces, contribution of the East to development of; tariff and revenue, 2817
Civil Service Commission, 2816
Old age pensions, 2817

Food. *See* Agriculture; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices

Food and Drugs Act
Administration, 697
Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Henry, Automobile duty, 2908

Fordney-McCumber Tariff. *See* United States

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade; Treaties, French, Italian

Foreign Policy. *See* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis

Foreign Vessels, registration. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Germans in Peace river district, 1184
Naturalization of. *See that title*

Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See* Dominion Forests

Forests and Forestry. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Natural Resources; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1748
Alberta, 1778
British Columbia, 1776
Manitoba, 1778
Nova Scotia, 1778
Ontario and Quebec, 1776, 1778

Forests and Forestry—*Con.*
Aeroplanes used in protection work, 1776
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 821, 2948, 3412, 4348
Campbell, Mr. R. H., Superintendent of Forestry, retirement, 3410
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Conservation, 2648, 2947, 2950, 4349. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Development, 2744
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Forest fires, 816
Conscription of fire-fighters, 3409
Fires started to make employment, 3409
Relief, 4010
Forest products, exports of, 1776. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Forest protection, 1776, qu. 2205, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 816
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 817, qu. 2178, qu. 2697, 3416
Moose mountain reserve, 3453
Spruce bud worm, 596, 2179
White pine blister rust, 595
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Moose mountain forest reserve, 3453
Provincial ownership, jurisdiction and responsibility, 3416
Pulp, paper, forest products, export, 2750. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Reforestation, 3412, 4349
Reserves. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Roads and bridges, 1014
Shelter belts, 459
Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial patrol, 1776
Tree-planting
Associations, 3415
Prairies, on, 3412
Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 34. Thanks to previous speakers for references to himself; congratulations to mover and seconder; resignation of Mr. Crerar as leader of Progressives, 34-35; Canada's position in relation to other countries; trek from country to city, 35; trade treaties; trade expansion 36; co-ordination of National Railways; new board of directors, Sir Henry Thornton, 36; lake freights inquiry; Crowsnest pass agreement, 36-37; immigration; natural resources, 37; farm labourers; tariff and taxation; revision of Bank Act; committee to inquire into agricultural problems, 38; causes of present agricultural depression, 38-39; bill to safeguard interests of consumers and producers; cattle embargo; economy in expenditure, 39; civil service reform, 39-40; redistribution; our national status, recommendations to government, 41
Agriculture
Condition of, 1107, 1852
Co-operation, 1852
Expenditure, 3240
Alberta coal, 794
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Banff national park, power leases, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4044, 4097, 4100, 4107
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 858
Banking and Commerce Com., member of, 2639
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3213
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4438
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Belle River harbour, 4606
Bounties, agriculture, 3240
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3456
Woollen goods, 3460, 3470
Budget
Reported statement on, 2946
Speech on, comment, 2853
Speech, 2711. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; budget disappointing; financial position of country; railway and shipping deficits, 2711; debt; increase in; economy; taxation a billion dollars a year; Britain's example to Canada; limit to tax-paying powers increasing cost of government, 2712; machinery of distribution; parasites between producer and consumer; tariff and tax changes; buying and selling; British preference; trade with Great Britain, 2713; best market for agricultural products, 2714; ocean freight rates; tariff and combines; natural resources; "stability of tariff" Liberal tariff policy; Moose Jaw election, 2714; handwriting on the wall; budget a disappointment to the West; exodus; agricultural and manufactured products, prices; Canada a dear country to live in; high cost of living; manufacturing industries, 2715; production, cost of; taxation of commodities; relations between farmer and manu-

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
facturer; agriculture, position of, 2716; potential wealth of the prairies; immigration, taxation and railway troubles; commercial rivalry; amendment, 2717
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3798, 3833
Canadian National railways
Appointments, 2472
Branch lines construction bill, 4192, 4338, 4399
Management, responsibility and powers, 3640
Minister's annual statement, 1617
Paris offices, 3646, 3672
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., reference to, 3672, 3678
Toronto office building, 3641
Cattle boats, conditions, 2613
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3641
Vessel space, 1868
Cheque tax, amendment, 3934, 3935
Chilled meat, 463
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 361, 565
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3986
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4236, 4290
Combines bill, 2579, 2618-36
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Copper bounty bill, 3240, 4376
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2145, 2346
Cost of living, 1813
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4254
Deceased members, tribute to, 7
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Depression in England, 1854
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Distribution, cost of, 1852
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 3983
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2252
Economic conditions, wealth production, 1856
Eggs, price of, 1852
Emigration to the United States, 1109
Europe, reconstruction, 4654
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1820
Experimental farms, 463
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Fishways, 3363
Free trade, 3024
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1932
Concession forced by Progressives, explanation, 2971
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1933
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1932
French Treaty bill, 2012, 2261, 2267
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 332-3
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Grondines wharf, 968
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1693
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1047
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1407, 1479
Letter not read by Prime Minister, 1333
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1336
Personal explanation, 1105
Detailed estimates, 1464, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 1464
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3593
Policy, 1105-1110
Imperial Conference, 4654
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians
Condition of, 2147
Manitoba, 2125
Sioux, 2159, 2160
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 231
Lake Grain Rates, royal commission, 3507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-32, 4285
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4178
Liberal policy, reversal of, 3007
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lunenburg dredging, 4577
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds 4238
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 845
Merchants' bank, 4297
Moose Jaw by-election, 2714
Delay in return, 2295
Naturalization Acts Amdt. 2187, 2193, 2454
Winnipeg Free Press editorial, 2454
Near East Crisis, 40
Newspapers
Monopoly, 2580
Postage, 4534

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Newspapers—*Con.*
Size of, 4534
North Essex by-election, 4606
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill, 4483
Oleomargarine, inquiry as to legislation, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3524, 3526
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3572
Patents of Invention bill, 2066
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3884, 4534
Postal appointments, 1800
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 2181
Protection and world conditions, 2752
Public buildings, Manitoba, 4629
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Redistribution, intention of government, 4250
References to, 11, 17, 18, 27, 55
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1150
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1790
Sales tax, 4431
Barley flour, 4431
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 920
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 3445
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-42
Shipping combine, 4223
Soldier settlement, 2027
Supplementary estimates, time of bringing down, 4555
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3968
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291
Trade barriers, 2214
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
M. to adjourn House, 4296
Vimy Ridge monument, 182
War, Canada's participation in, 4655
War claims, 2496
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Woollen industry, protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Forrester, Mr. William (South Perth)
Linen yarn duty, 3897

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406

Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2573

Fort William
Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grain shipments, 1114
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 2831. War sacrifices; Liberal party heir to burdensome estate; public debt; Canadian National railways; deficits; economy; improved financial situations; borrowings and interests payments; taxation, reduction of; tariff; downward revision; reciprocity, 2831; resources; British preference; introduction and further increase of; French and Italian treaties; friendly relations between France and Canada; Rodin's statue of France; gift of site for Vimy memorial; Canadian National railways, management; President and board, 2832; western settlement made possible by railway construction; British Columbia; Quebec; Transcontinental railway; development of Abitibi region; contribution of railways to development of country; immigration, 2833; land awaiting settlement; provincial land grants; emigration to the United States; natural increase of population; immigrants, recruiting and selecting; choice of location, 2834; repatriation; the future, 2835
British preference, 2832
Woollen goods, 3458
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canadian National railways, branch lines, 4199
Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power) 548
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Immigration, 2833
Colonization in eastern provinces, 1134
Policy, 1134
Quebec into, 1104
Labelle country development, 4199
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 235
Montford railway, 4199
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3984
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3543
Patents of Invention bill, 2071, 2098
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Ruling as chairman, 4293
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1296

Fortin and Moffatt, Transcontinental railway claim, 3646

Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Foster Homes. *See* Immigration, Child

Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent of Fisheries, 1548

Fox-Breeding Industry, 588, 2763

France. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Agricultural products, 2247
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Canadian Commissioner General, 4001
Canadian travelling exhibition in, 811, 4711
Convention of commerce with. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Devastated areas, reconstruction, 2012, 2219
Exports and imports, 1977, 1997, 2004, 2015, 2210, 2213, 2222
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Franc, value of, 2009
Franco-German relations, 4652
Friendly relations with, 2216
German reparations, 440. *See also* Germany
Immigration from, 1085, 1173
Imports from. *See* Imports and Exports; Treaties, French Treaty
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Paris agency, 4001
Peace treaty and. *See* Germany, reparations
President of, letter from, Vimy Ridge memorial, 1538
Reciprocity treaty with Great Britain, 3050
Relations with, 2832
Rodin's statue, 2832
Ruhr, invasion of, 2748, 2822
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Surplus, 2823
Tariff against Canadian goods, 1999, 2015
Trade relations with, 1990, 1995, 2218
Trade treaties with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Termination of, 1999
Vimy Ridge, gift of memorial site, 1538, 2832. *See also* Vimy Ridge
War losses, 2215, 2256
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections
Amendment to Act, inquiry, 3223
Equality of citizenship between men and women, 3059
Hindu, 503, 4640. *See also that title*
Withholding of, 2456
Women, to, 408
Orientals to. See Immigration, Orientals; Naturalization

Fraser River
Fisheries. *See* British Columbia Fisheries
Improvements, 1003, 1006

Fraud, obtaining fiats by. *See* Petition of Right Bill

Fredericton experimental farm, 460, 471

Free Trade. *See also* Budget; Copper Bounty bill; Export Act Amdt. bill; Hemp Bounty bill
Advocacy of in western Canada, 2752
Agriculture, 1858
Binder twine, 4379
Difficulties in the way of, 3010
Effect of in different sections, 1246
Free list, goods on. *See* Budget; Customs; Reciprocity
Great Britain, 1858, 2721, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3012, 3050, 3059, 3847
Liberal party and, 3068
Necessities of life, 1230
No cure for Canada's ills, 2982
Not a practical question, 2745
Potatoes, 2820
Progressive party amd, 1196, 2818, 3030
Protection and, 2806, 2922
Pulpwood, prohibition of, 4349
Tariff stability, 2648
Tendency towards protection, 2822, 3009
Theory and practice, 3050
United States, 1113, 2737, 2746

Freight Cars. *See* Canadian National Railways

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canals; Grain and Grain Trade; Hudson Bay Railway; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterways; Transportation
Adverse. *See* Immigration; Vancouver Harbour bill
Agriculture and, 1416, 1424
Alberta, discrimination against, 1957, 1958
Apples and vegetables, Nova Scotia to Montreal and Toronto, 626
British Columbia
Discrimination against, 1914
Equalization, 1911, 1914
Building materials, 1961, 3036
Brick and cement, 3017
Butter, 1961
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. Sir Henry Thornton, 3845
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canned goods and fish, 1915
Cattle export trade, 2127, 2963, 3040

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Cheese, 1961
Chemicals, 1920
Coal, 84, 795, 1264, 1272, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Alberta, 1275, 1282, 3009
Excessive, 1345
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Maritime provinces, 1813
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators' Association, res. 1275
United States railways, 1266
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4290
Consumers and, 1958
Control of, 4226
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1620, 1912, 2741, 2836, 2852, 2854. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill and *under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Charge that Progressives had forced concession, 2854, 2875
Explanation by Mr. Forke, 2971
Discrimination in favour of Western Canada, 3239
Furniture manufacturers, 2855, 2875
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway receipts, decrease of, 3036
Restoration of rates, results, 1620
Saving absorbed by lake shipping companies, 2961
Discrimination, 130, 3195. *See under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization; *see also* Railway Act Amdt.
Downward revision, 3195
Eggs, 1962
Emigration and, 1440
Equalization. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. bill *and under this title,* Railway Rates
Fish, 1953, 1964, 2946
Flour, 1914, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906, 2761
Freight classification, 1618, 2876
Grain, 260, 1914, 1960, 1965, 2854, 3194, 3680
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343
High, 2812
Highways and, 1619
Hudson Bay railway 1035, 3779
Immigration and, 1133, 1181
Increase of, 1134, 3190
Iron and steel, 1964
Lake and river, 3776
Fixing, 4284
Lower, demand for, 3024
Lumber, 1961, 2875
Pulpwood, ties and, 3036

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Manitoba, 1932
Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Maritime provinces, 1963
Mountain scale, 1912
Operating costs and, 1761
Pacific standard tariff, 1914
Potatoes on, 137-138
Prairie scale, 1912, 1915
Railway and shipping, 1051, 1114, 1395, 4226. *See also under this title,* Shipping
Railway Commission
Appeal from, 1912
Hearing, 3190
Railway rates
Attorney General of British Columbia vs. C.P.R. 1916
Equalization of, 1400, 1437, 2868, 3191
British Columbia, terms of union, 1916
Canadian Northern and British Columbia, guarantee, 1917
Control of rates, 1917
Canadian Pacific railway construction of, 1916
Carvell, Hon. F. B., letter to Associated Boards of Trade, 1915
Construction, cost, 1918
Earnings, 1919
Grain, 1921
Long haul, 1920
M. (Mr. Clark) 1284, 1490, 1911, 1914
Ruling of Mr. Speaker, 1284, 1307
Oliver, Hon. John, 1915, 1952, 1955
Operation, cost, 1918
Railway Commission, judgment of June 30th, 1922, 1914
Traffic, density of, 1920
Railway transportation costs committee, evidence, 1919
Railways, qu. 625
Canadian National railways, 3621. *See also that title*
Saving by projected Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2899
Reduction of, 1101, 1400, 2800, 2868, 3194
Rice, 1915
Shipping, 144, 171, qu. 206, 310, 1395, 4077. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Agricultural conditions, Special Com. report, 2127
Armstrong bill, 4284, 4290
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 3848
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613, 3806
Vessels, qu. 3262

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Shipping—*Con.*
Canadian Liner Committee, 2127
Cattle, shipment to Great Britain, 2127, 2963, 3040
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 494, 2959, 4231
Combine, 2578, 2581, 2583, 2667, 2828, 2954, 2960, 4223, 4226, 4277
Control of by Railway Commission, qu. 2611
Discrimination, 4290
Canadian ports, against, 2960
Dominion Marine Association, 2613
Flour, 2127
Freight and passenger, 2174
Grain, 2517, 2828, 4290
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, 14, 36, 48, 52, 68, 206, 247, 302, qu. 2611
Increase of, 2960
Lake and ocean, 3763
Lake grain rates. *See that title*
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 1395, qu. 2611, qu. 2612, 2710, 3960
Personnel, 4231, 4234
Report, 2885, 4277
Legislation, 3265, 3507
Printing, 2927, 3045
Salaries and expenses, 4710
Live stock, 2133, 2758
New York pool, 3806
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, 2760
Ocean, 2127
Flour, Canadian, discrimination, 2761
Livestock rates, 2758. *See also* Livestock
Return cargoes, 2714
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
"Shipping barons", 2960
Standard Shipping Company, 1704, 4278
Steamship combines, 2667
Subsidized steamships, 2714, 4003. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly Liner Committee, 2127
Welland canal, 3762
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704
Wolvin, Messrs, 4285. *See also* Lake Grain Rates Bill
Textiles, 1964
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1915, 3848
Transfer charges, 2876
Transportation cost committee, 1944
United States, 2801
Waterways, 1619
Western Canada and, 1887

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Westward from prairie provinces, M. (Mr. Clark) 1158. *See also under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Wheat, discrimination in favour of, 2946

French-Canadians
Bravery and courage, 165, 2935
Deputy Ministers, 1805
Repatriation, 1462
Settlement in New Ontario, 1401

French Language
Difficulties, 1341
Editorial Committee, elimination of French publications, 1670
Immigration officials, Quebec, qu. 4752
Insurance bill, French version, 3147
Magazines and periodicals, 842
References to, 166
Translation and printing, 1489
Bills, 4435

French River improvement work, qu. 620, 2682

French Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Frenette, Mr. George, postmaster, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698

Fruit. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Treaties, French Treaty
Apples
Imports, qu. 617
New varieties, 2307
Banana trust, 2979
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Combines, 2616
Competition from United States, 2977, 2980
Dehydration of, 4674
Dumping clause, 2988
Estimates, 598
Fiji islands, from, 1848
Foreign
Competition, 2979
Importation, 2979
Taxation of, 2979
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Fruit-growing industry
Annapolis valley, 104, 2763
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Depression, 3002
Niagara district, 104, 2225, 2763, 2765
Fruit union of the Okanagan, 2526
Grading. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers
Grape-growing industry, 2742. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Grapes, export, 2270

Fruit—*Con.*
Grape-growing—*Con.*
Price in Niagara district, 2225
Wine manufacture, 1977
Imports of dried and prepared fruit, 445
Insects and pests, 596
Inspection. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit
Marketing, 463
Mediterranean, importation, 1636
Pears, new varieties, 2307
Plums, new varieties, 2307
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Pre-cooling plant, 464, 2056, 2765. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill
Prunes and dried plums, 3474
Raisins, imports of, qu. 2699
Duty, 2657, 2718, 3474. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff items
Sale and Inspection. *See that title*
Trees, new varieties, 2307

Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Fuel Oil. *See also* Oil
California and Oklahoma, 1245
Importation of, 1245

Fuel Supply, 84, qu. 203. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Oil; Railways
Adams, Dr. Frank D., coal situation, 1265
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4691
Anthracite coal, embargo on, 4394
Bermingham, Mr., President Delaware and Lackawana Railway, evidence, 1279
Camsell, Dr. Charles, Deputy Minister of Mines, 1265
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Central heating plants, 3199
Coal. *See also that title*
Alberta
Freight rate on, 3009
Mines, 3424
Areas in Canada, 1344
Cost, 1700, 3198. *See also* Cost of Living
Duty, 3493
Embargo on United States, 1279
Freight rates, 2828, 2875
Imports, qu. 516, 2828
Production and, qu. 490
Offset by exports of electric energy, 1266
Mines, 2785
Canadian, 1247, 1344
Prices, 3198
Substitutes for, 3199
Welsh, 3199
Coking. *See also* Coal, Coke

Fuel Supply—*Con.*
Coking—*Con.*
Coke-ovens, establishment of, 788
Municipal plants, 3200
Dominion Fuel Board
Salaries and expenses, 3197
Statement of work and suggestions, 3199
Exploitation, 1344
Federal Advisory Fuel Committee, 1274, 3198
Freight rates, 1919, 2855, 2875, 3199, 3200
Fuel testing, 789, 3197
House construction, 3203
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
Investigation, 3427
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509, 2512, 3206
Lignite Utilization Board, 387, 2515
Mines and Minerals Committee
Suggested reference to 1271
Report, 4436, 443
M. (Mr. Church) for a national fuel policy, 1262
Amdt. (Mr. Carroll) for reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Suggested amendment of, 1284
Oil shale deposits, 2513
Peat
Alfred peat plant, qu. 1487
Experiments, 790, 3199
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Public ownership and, 3200, 3205
Pulverized fuel 3199
Resources, 1264
Shortage, deaths of children from, 751, 1657
Sifton, Sir Clifford, on, 1265
Smith, Mr. George Otis, export of coal from United States 1265
Special committee, appointment of, qu. 617. *See also under this title,* Mines and Minerals
Steam, 789
Thornton, Sir Henry, evidence, 1919
Waters powers, 3203

Fundy. *See* Bay of Fundy

Fungus and Insect Diseases. *See* Insect Pests

Furness Withy Company, ocean rates, 2127

Furniture
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855, 2875
French Treaty, 1982, 1989
House of Commons, qu. 1138

Furs
French treaty, 1981
Sales tax, 2742

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Gallipoli Peninsula. *See* Near East Crisis

Gambling. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Gambling
Futures, in, 3058
Staples of life, in, 3058
Stock exchange, 3058

Game. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423

Gaols. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries; Capital punishment at. *See that title*

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Agricultural conditions, 1903
Agricultural exports, 1904
Audibility of debate, 4580
Bacon, Canadian prices, 1905
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4095, 4096
Bank officials, as insurance agents, 4095
Belle River harbour, 4601
Business of the House
Bills, distribution, 4276
Bills not printed, 4185
M. that Committee rise, 4185
Business profits tax, arrears, 4491
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Canada Highways bill, 2342
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4321
Coal leases, 3424
Copper bounty bill 3436
Cost of living, reduction, 1907
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1806
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms 470-486
Exports and imports, 1841
Farm credits, 1907
Farm mortgages 1841
Farmers, competition with world, 3236
Flour, price in Canada and Britain, 1906
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of Canadian grain at United States ports, 3650
Grain commissioners, board of, 787
Grain samples for exhibitions, 1454, 1455
Grazing
Lands, southern Alberta, 3424

Gardiner, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Grazing—*Con.*
Leases, 3426
Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line, 4321
Highways, Alberta, 2342
Hogs, grading, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Expenditure, 1908
Policy, 1903
Indemnity of members, 4237
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4205, 4276
Land valuation, 1878
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192-3
Lunenburg harbour, 4580
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3409
Manitoba, agricultural conditions, 1906
Medicine Hat customs employees, qu. 3505
National parks
Banff, electric light plant, 3435
Water power leases, 3939
Natural resources of western provinces, 3424
Oil
Leases, 3423
Monitor district, 2514
Speculation in claims, 3423
Postal appointments, 1801, 1806
Postmasters, 1809
Railway mail service, 1801
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways, 1791
Saskatoon-Edmonton, 1790
Rural depopulation, 1906
Rural mail delivery, 1801
Seed inspection, weed seeds, 197
Seed Purchasing Commission, 601
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt bill, 4185, 4237-4246
Amdt. six months' hoist, neg. 4246
Settlers
Relief, 3448
Transportation facilities for, 2172
Soldier settlement, 2024
Land valuation, 1878
Salvage cases in Quebec, 2029
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Inspection of, 2178
Stockyards, discrimination, 192
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff, agricultural conditions and, 1907
Tree-planting association, 3415
Water power leases, 3422
Western provinces, conditions in, 1903

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Advisory Fuel Committee, 4691
Agricultural conditions, 1201

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Alberta
Coal resources, 801, 1275, 4692
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Arctic expedition, new ship, 4702
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4069, 4078-4126
Business and powers of banks, amdt., agency, 4093, withdrawn, 4094
Interest rate, 4125
Bank mergers, 4237
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3211
Banks and banking
Pressure on farmers, 1202
Profits, 1209
Buffalo, slaughter of, 4702
Business of the House, private members' day, 1158
Cahill, Mr., speech on immigration, 1209
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, war claims, qu. 3142
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3809
Amdt. to reduce, 3395, neg. 3398
Trade agreement, 3392
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3414
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advance, 3824, 3838
Canadian National railways
Advance of $1,550,000, 4694
Branch lines bill, 4308-22, 4694
Hanna-Warden-Loverna railway, qu. 4436
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1203
Net earnings, 1130
Canned salmon, shipment via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Coal. *See also under this title,* Alberta
Alberta, shipment to Ontario, 1163
Bituminous, duty on, 1275
Combines bill, 2616
Commodity prices, increase in, 1084
Copper bounty bill, 3238, 3241
Credits, function, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 647
Customs duty on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3275
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4253
Dominion Lands and Parks, salaries, 3251
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1011
Emigration to the United States, 1206
Employment service, director of, 1676
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farm buildings, 4630
Exports, agricultural machinery and farm products, 814
Farmers and bankruptcy, 3211
Farming equipment, 1088
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt bill, 4540

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Fish culture, 3371
Fishing schooner race, 115
Fuel and power resources, 801, 3427
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1275
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 327
Government publications, distribution, 1715
Grain, Canadian, adulteration at United States ports, 3649, 3962
Hamilton public building, 4628
Hanna-Warden and Loverna-Warden branch lines, 4308, 4322, 4436
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hector celebration, grant, 4705
M. to reduce, 4706
Historical celebrations, grants for, 4706
Homestead inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenburg leases, cancellation, 3146
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1208
Agreement, signing of, 1976
Empire settlement scheme, 1204, 1205
Immigration, population, natural increase, 1871-1921, 1207
Literature, misrepresentations, 1203
National railways and, 1121
Policy, 1200
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement, 1204
Steamship companies and, 1201
"The Unseen Hand," 1201
Total expenditure on, 1208
Indemnity of members, 4242
Indians
Blackfeet reserve, 2148
British Columbia, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Greater production, 2150
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Interest, 4107, 4125
International boundary, survey and demarcation, 3248
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Land leasing, 1101
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3352
Marine biological board, 3371
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, salary, 3352
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3985
Northwest territories, new ship, 4702
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, monument, 4704
Penitentiaries, 770
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3870
Pickled fish, inspection of, 3367
Plamondon, Alberta, dredging, 1013
Political patronage, 3347

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4678
Printing bureau, 1710
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 4614
Saskatchewan, 4629
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Renovated butter, 4253
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 776
Royal Mail Packet Company's boats, 3390
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3341
Sackville public buildings, 4613
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184, 4242
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Steamship services, 4702
Canada-West Indies, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Subsidies, grants and bonuses, 3414
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Water powers, development of, 3422
Welland canal, lumber imports for, qu, 1867
Western wheat crop and taxes, 1220
West Indies
Steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Trade with, 3395

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Caraquet railway, purchase price, qu. 1258
Coal imports and production, qu. 490
Daylight saving, Ottawa, qu. 2612
Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085
Soldier settlement, farms in Carleton county, qu. 1031

Gasoline. *See also* Oil
Price of, 2547
Short measure, 810

Gaspé Peninsula
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Natural resources, 1242
Railway facilities, 4186, 4197, 4307
Steamship services, 2176

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Wednesday evening sittings, 1163, 1995, 2518
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial pensioners, passes, qu. 2418
Superannuation, qu. 2418
Civil service superannuation, qu. 940, 3266
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Labrador gold rush 1995, qu. 2696
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3351

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Printing, Joint Committee on, Reports
First, 1156
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4009, 4436
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238

Gélinas, Mr. J. N., postmaster, St. Barnabé Nord, 1830

Gendron, Mr R. M. (Wright)
Public Works paymaster, qu. 1257

General Election. *See* Elections, Election of 1921

Geneva, International Labour Conference, 1441, 1539. *See also* Labour

Genoa Conference
Tariffs
Economic warfare, 3053
Stability, 3053

Geodetic Survey
Expenditure, qu. 1634, 3073. *See also* Mines; Surveys
Investigation, etc., 3245

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines; Surveys
British Columbia, 2504
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Expenditure by provinces, 2508
New Brunswick, explorations in, 2504
Overlapping, 2508
Revenue, 2510

George, Little, deportation of, qu. 1704

George, Right Hon. David Lloyd. *See* Lloyd George

Georgetown wharf, 4587

Georgian Bay
Canal. *See* Canals
Ports, grain handling, qu. 620

Georgetown-Montague railway, 128

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt bill (Seasonal or temporary employment) 666
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 435
French treaty, wines, 452, 2225
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184
Redistribution, Welland county, 667
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
Water powers, 3784
Sales tax, 4414, 4427, 4431
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Welland canal construction, 3762, 3784

Germany. *See also* France
Canadian Pacific railway shares, 2496
Franco-German relations, 4652
Franco-Prussian War indemnity, 3070
Immigration from, 1094
Nickle, shipments to during war, 4371
Reichsrat, constitution of, 1372
Reparations, 2498, 4653, 440, 4053
Investigation by Hon. William Pugsley, qu. 4753. *See also* Pugsley
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for withdrawal of of Canada's claims, 280, 311, 330, 332
Rhineland, cost of occupation, qu. 2696
Ruhr valley, occupation by France, 2748, 2822
War claims. *See also that title*
Investigation, qu. 1486, 2946
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Personal explanation, 4249

Gibeau, Mrs., postmistress, Morinville, 1028

Girl Guides, grant, 114, 3954

Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., British tariff reduction 3050

Glanders. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Gold. *See also* Mines and Minerals; Labrador
Export of prohibited 4249, 4405
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Golf Course, Jasper park, 3435

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Acland, Mr. F. A., 1675
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314, 4034, 4063, 4066, 4078-4103, 4141-59
Amdt., bank charters extended for one year, 4141, neg. on div. 4147
Charters, terms of, 1314
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4142
Point of order, 4055
Shareholders' audit, 4088
"Sincerity and integrity" 4067
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4142
Banting, Dr. F. G. annuity, 4676
Bees, suppression of foul brood in, 4675

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Board of Audit bill, 4369
British preference
Canadian ports direct importation, 3456
Manufacturing industries, and, 3472
Business of the House
Bills not distributed, 4104
Private members' day, 1160
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Cadet services, 883
Canadian National Railways bills
Branch lines construction, 4401
Securities, 4526
Capitalistic system and labour organizations, 2895
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 568
Civil Service patronage, 368
Class antagonism, prevention of, 1233
Combines bill, registrar, inquiry, 2624
Commercial union, 3906, 3911
Conversion loan, qu. 386
Co-operation, industrial relations, 2895
Copper bounty bill, 4374
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4252, 4263, 4270
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4673
Estimates, method of discussion, 4614-6
Experimental farms
Buildings, 4630
Overlapping, 4633
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4396
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Fertilizers, duty, 3487
Foreign relations, 4659
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 341
Health of animals, 4676
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4390
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4660
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1118
Hindu, 1120
Policy, 1116-1120
Imperial Conference 4640-4666
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 4660
Confidential matters, 4660
Preferential tariff, 4661
Imperial Economic Conference, 4659, 4666
Agenda, 4250
Interest rate, 4131
International questions, opportunity for discussion, 3998
Joint industrial councils, 1655

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Labour
Cheap, 1118
Estimates, reduction in, 1643
Gazette, editor, 1671, 1675
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 220, 222
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4227
Land, vacant, taxation of, 1104, 1118
League of Nations, 3998
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Liquor exports and imports, 3704
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Manila fibre bounties, 4369
Merchants' bank, investigation, 4068, 4156
Money, purchasing power of, 4666
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll)
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that legislation be submitted before end of session, 3567
Point of order, 3571
Petroleum bounty, 3916, 3918
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Privilege, question of veracity, 2181
Proportional representation, 427
Lord Bryce, 391
M. for alternative vote in single-member constituencies, 388
Multi-member constituencies, M., 389
Protection and industries, 3472
Public debt, maturing obligations, 3822
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4396
Race-track betting, M., 494, 709, 764
Railways and canals dept., salaries, 3195
Raney, Hon. W. E., letter from, 2181
Reciprocity with United States, 3905
Offer to negotiate, 3908
Renovated butter, 4252, 4263, 4270
Rideau Hall expenditure, 4627
Rural mail carriers, names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Stationery, embossed, 1716
Tariff stability, 3054
Toronto
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621, 4622
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unearned increment, appropriation by state, 1119
United States tariff, 1119
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Woollen goods, prices, 3463

Good roads. *See* Highways

Goods, Marking of. *See* Imports and Exports

Goodspeed, Mr. F. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Gordon, Mr. George N. *See* Deputy Speaker

Gordon, Sir Charles, director Bank of Montreal, 4022

Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, Vancouver, shipments, 2519, 2615

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 1080, 2051, 2204, 3318
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2052
Bankruptcy Act
Administration, 780
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1523
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 2252, 3085-3127, 3209-21
Farmer and, 3211
Senate amendments, 4201
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2423
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-16, 2419-23
Capital punishment, 769
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 1483, 2281
Opium joints, etc., 2281
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971, 2053
Directorships, 4024
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2355
Good, Mr., statement with regard to Hon. W. E. Raney, 2182
Guessing competitions, 733
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 3128
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3264, 3452, 3604
Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Department, estimates, 705
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Lake of the Woods Regulation Act repeal bill, 2885, 4163, 4179, 4185
Liquor, government control, 2406
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 180, 270
Senate amendments, 2050
Pecuniary claims convention, 779
Penitentiaries, 706
Estimates, 770

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer—*Con.*
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 2639, 3127
Fiats, 3224
Race-track betting. *See also under this title,* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
M. (Mr. Good) 738, 743
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Legal adviser, 778
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment, 1147
Naturalization, 778
Pensions, 776
Reorganization, 776
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-48
Tariff stability, ref. to, 2819
Washington, visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Accredited herd system, 587
Agricultural conditions in West, 1357
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Annual drill, 4636
Artificial silk duty, 3452
Australia, land settlement, 1389
Automobile accidents, 3958
Belle river harbour, 4610
Bienfait briquetting plant, 3206
British and foreign news service, 4713
Budget, 2951; congratulations to Finance Minister; last two budgets disappointing; Liberal promises and performances; tariff planks of 1896 and 1919; broken pledges, 2951; reciprocity; Liberal platform of 1919, duties upon implements of production; appeal to the West; speeches of the Minister of Agriculture; curtain lectures to Progressives, 2952; agricultural conditions; municipal taxation, non-payment; advice to farmers; more work and mixed farming; Canada a great exporting country; charge of extravagance unfounded; utterances of Mr. Motherwell, 2953; combines; lake freights; terminal elevators; Price, Waterhouse & Company report; elevator profits; income tax; unearned income, 2954; harbour facilities; free sites to elevator companies, Fort William; land speculators; stumping machines; tariff on implements of production and necessaries of life; amendment; special committee on the

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff; tariff revision; permanent tariff commission to investigate industries, 2955; the "say-so" of tariff beneficiaries; watered stock, dividends; debt; direct taxation; government ownership, 2956; bounties; flax industry; hemp industry; special privileges; oleomargarine; protected industries; Progressive party and power, 2957
Business profits tax, 4489
Canada Grain Act, administration, 4710
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3408
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4198, 4325
Paris offices, 3679
Public ownership, 3679
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3958
Cheque tax, 3932
Chief Electoral Officer, salaries, 4001
Combines bill, 2627
Copper bounty bill, 3235, 3241, 4375
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Deputy ministers
Perquisites, 4669
Salaries, increase, 4669, 4673
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Dredging, Fort William and Port Arthur, 3341
Emigration to the United States, 1389
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farms, 468, 4632
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4273
Free trade, Progressive party and, 1196
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 1762
French treaty, 442
Fuel supply, 799
Grain and grain trade
Grain commissioners, salaries, 4710
Grain unsold, 273
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 296
Mixing of grain, 1388
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Wheat in farmers' hands, Saskatchewan, 1975
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of animals, 577, 587
Hector celebration, 4636
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1357, 1878
Child, 1470

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Policy, 1356, 1387
Publicity, special writers, 1874
Income tax, agricultural forms, 4498
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4498
Indians, agricultural production, 2162
Interest rates on land payments, 1088
Labour Gazette correspondents, 1627
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4235
Liberal platform of 1919, 2853
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201, 2203
Maritime provinces, public expenditure, 4586
Military hospitals, 673
Moose mountain
Forest reserve, insect pests, 3453
Indian reserve, qu. 706
Pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Parliament buildings
Estimated and actual cost, 1725
Tower, 1722
Passports, issuing of, 4707
Peebles-Lampman branch railway, 4325
Petroleum bounty, 3920
Prices of binders and labour, 1886
Printing bureau, new building, 1738
Protection
Applications for, 3235
Granted without investigation, 3489
Public expenditure, apportionment of, 4559, 4560
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2503
Pugsley, and Meighen, Messrs., exchange of compliments, 2503
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 3951
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3475
Reciprocity
Agreement of 1911, 2854
Agricultural implements, 3499
Boots and shoes, 3499
Coal, 3499
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4491
St. John, N. B., visit to by members of parliament, 2503
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3788
School lands
Balance due on purchase price, 1389
Unpaid taxes, 4205
Seed inspection, 197-8
Shipping combine, 4235
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salaries, 669
Steamship subsidies, 4004
Topographical survey, towers, 2512
Trade commissioners, 1840

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Tuberculosis in cattle, 587
Welland canal construction, 3788
Western provinces, conditons in, 1357, 1388

Government. *See also* Legislation
Appointment of supporters, 2710
Burdensome and costly, 2719
Business principles applied to, 2806
Canada a difficult country to govern, 2796, 2852, 3002, 3023, 3074
Capitalistic hold upon, 2726
Civil government, retrenchment, 2964
Commission, by, 428, 4037, 4039
Committees, by, 2979
Cost of, 1153, 2785, 2805, 2968, 3027
Increasing, 2712, 2756
"Cuckoo" 3451, 3510
Decentralization of, 66
Departments, increase in cost of, 2970
Difficulties of, 2796
Duplication and overlapping of services, 2805
Economy, 2816, 2823, 2825, 2831, 2842, 2921, 2950, 2959, 2963, 2969, 3043, 3073, 3076, 4236
Indemnity of members, 4236
New methods of, 2914
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Taxation unaccompanied by, 2997
Financial control of, 2812
Group government, 1427
Senate and, 1378
Supply, amdts. to, 1299
Inconsistency, 2990
Invisible, 2812
Irresponsible, 2979
Offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Officials, travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Order in Council, by, 4354, 4487. *See also* Orders in Council
Policies, review of, 407,409
Resignation of. See Lack of Confidence Vote
Responsibility of, 2805
Retrenchment, 2805
Too much from Ottawa, 3434

Government Ownership. *See* Public Ownership

Government Printing. *See* Printing

Government Publications. *See also* Editorial Committee; Printing
Agricultural, 598, 1428
Distribution of, 1712, 3266
Fisheries, 3364
Interior department, 3443

Government Publications—*Con.*
Mines and Geological Survey, 3197
Printing, 811
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste in, 1734
Waste paper sold, 1713
Judge Snider's report, 1714
Governor General
Address, acknowledgement of, 1256
Expenditure, 4627
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Royal assent, 4755. *See also that title*
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; travels in western Canada and Yukon; improvement in economic conditions; trade conventions with France and Italy; Canadian National Railways consolidation; Great Lakes shipping; anti-combines and trusts legislation; cattle embargo; abundant harvest; immigration publicity campaign; Bank Act revision; redistribution; Postal Conference; Vimy Ridge site, 2-3
Speech on prorogation, 4756
Vimy Ridge memorial, 2, 1631
Governor in Council, judicial or administrative power, 1912
Grading of Seeds. *See* Seed Inspection
Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of National Defence; Minister of Railways and Canals from April 28, 1923.)
Address in reply, 54; The late Minister of Railways, 54; new members; Mr. Forke, 54-55; the railway problem, mileage of Canadian National railways; value of property; employees, 55; history of acquisition and amalgamation, 55-63; Canadian Northern, acquisition, 55-57; Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59; Grand Trunk acquisition, 59-60; amalgamation under one board of directors, 60; formal transfer of Grand Trunk, 60-61; amalgamation of Canadian National and Grand Trunk, 61; purchase of rolling stock, 61; establishment of headquarters, 62-63
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4692
Agriculture estimates, form of, 610
Alaskan, wreck of, 3173
Ammunition, 884, 1740, 1741
Appointment as Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Atherley bridge, 3648
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4197
Belle river harbour, 4599, 4606
Bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
British mails, delay in, 2694
Brockville rifle range, 889
Bruederheim branch line railway, 4316
Business of the House
Motions, anticipatory, 3327
Privilege, Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Involving lengthy answers, 622
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 4303
Placed on order paper without members' knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Supply, calling of, 2296
Cadet services, 877
Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill, 2253, 2338, 2469, 2470. *See also under this title,* Highways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983, 3208, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3377, 3798, 3824, 3841
Deficits, 3816
Earnings and expenditure, 3399
Lease of freighters, 3848
Negotiation for sale of ships, 1976
Canadian National Railways, 55-63
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650
$13,099,493.34, 1764, 3376
$1,550,000, 4692
Statements of appropriation, 1922-23, 1923-24, 3789
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Colonel, reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 3646, 4188, 4197, 4303-4344, 4397, 4694
Expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4400
Finance, 4319, 4330
Rejection by Senate, 4695
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Bituminous, duty, 1278
Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027.
Correspondence, inquiry for, 244
Dominion Express Company, contract, termination, 2473
Employees' pension, 288
Estimates, 1619
Opportunity to discuss, 3703
Expenditure, 4304
Express business and sale of electric lines bill, 2392, 2470, 2479
Radial railways, sale of, 2479, qu. 2612
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Express and electric lines—*Con.*
Freight rates, 1620. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Coal, on, 1278, 1280
Grand Trunk, 58-60
Gratuities to directors and officials, royal commission, 1665, 1976
Ocean ports, 1760
Providence, 1762
United States, 1762
Hanna, Mr. D. B., retirement of, 1666
Hudson Bay railway and, 1067
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 1635, 2048, 2105
Insurance, rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 1760
Pensions, 3196
Management
Non-interference with, 2472, 3670
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3654
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 55, 3197
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646
Ocean ports, 1760
Operating deficits, 3701
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3626, 3650, 3681, 3682, 4514
M. (Mr. Stevens) 3670
Pre-audit, 3701
Public ownership, 2475, 3670, 4198
Railway Commission and, 666
Regions, boundaries of, 1754
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1484
Robb, Mr., 2471
St. John station, 3646
St. John terminals, 2481, 4311
Securities bill, 4515
Thomas, Mr. A. J., appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3670, 3675
Appointment
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4198
Office building, 1664, 3629
Viaduct and union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Toronto Suburban railways, sale of, qu. 2612
Transcontinental
Conditions and prospects, 3681
Fortin & Moffatt, claim, 3646
Quebec port and, 3681

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Transcontinental—*Con.*
Unification, 1666, 3196
Chinese immigration bill, 2332
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 550
Civil Service
Postmasters, appointments, 1823, 1827
Returned soldiers, 1773
Copper bounty bill, 4373
Credits, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Demers, Mr. Amedee, contract, 1977
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1807
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 665
Estimates, civil government, form of, 610, 668
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Fiset, Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Forest preservation, 3416
Freight rates
Coal, 1278, 1280
Comparison, 1620
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1930
Equalization, 3192
Railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1925
Fuel supply, 793
Advisory fuel committee, 1278, 4692
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4197
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 280
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Grants to military and rifle associations, 889
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Highways. *See also under this title,* Canada Highways Act
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Canada Highways Commissioner, staff, 2489, 3173
Federal grant, 519
Hamilton-Brantford, 2492
Ontario, 2490
Statements
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Tabulated, 3174
Hudson Bay railway,
Canadian Air force, 1749
Construction vote, 4681
Dominion lands, sale of, 1068
Feasibility of route, 1068
M. (Mr. Knox) 1066

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Co., refund, 4687, 4690
Port Nelson Terminal, 3647
Repair of second 118 miles, 1070, 4198
Turning first sod, 1069
Welland canal and, 1068, 3779
Work this year, 4310
Hydro electric power, radial railways, 2475
Immigration, Canadian National railways and Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island employees, pensions, 3196
Inverness railway, 4198
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Kent Northern railway, 4197
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 236
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 1740, 2053, 2086
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4197
National Defence
Ammunition, 884
England from, value and quantities, 1740
Quantity on hand, 1741
Annual training, 859
Cadet service, 877
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749, 1775
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, 1778
Forestry protection work, 1776
Mail carrying, 1775
Operation, maintenance, repairs, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Department, salaries and contingencies, 901
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740-4
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Expenditure, 1744
Estimates, 859, 1740
Grants to rifle associations, 889
Military districts, reduction of, 868
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia expenditures, statement of, 1747
Officers retired, 890
Permanent force, 892
Schools of instruction, 900
Staff
Pay, 891
Reduction, 1773
Naval service, 902
Department of National Defence and, 3342
War claims, adustment of, Llandovery Castle, 1745
North Essex by-election, 4606

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Nova Scotia miner's strike, use of troops, 868, 893
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3571
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1833
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1816, 1826
Post Office
Department
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1805, 1807, 1826
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Excise taxes, payment in postage stamps, 1815
Printing, 1818, 1820
Revenue not attribuable to postal service, 1815, 1818, 1820
Salaries, 1780, 1794
Staff, reductions 1824
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1687
Letter carriers, bonus, 1784
Mail contractors, 3144
Mail service, 1778
Postal rates
Reduction of, 1780
Special delivery, 1873
Postmasters
Appointments held in suspension, 1832
Clementsport, 1797
Woodbridge, 1823
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786, 1801, 1805
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. C., 1823
Carriers, 1784, 3264
Compensation for loss, 1833
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144
Routes, spur lines, 1826
Statistics of, 1801
Western provinces, 1802
Extension, 1790
Saskatoon, accommodation, 1785
Toronto
New building, 1780
Revenue, 1780
Prince Edward Island railway
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Pensions, 3196
Railway employees, death of, 3196
Public buildings
Ontario, 4615
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public ownership of railways, 3670, 4198
Radial railways, 2475
Toronto street railway, 2475

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Public Works, expenditure, apportionment, 4578
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment and salary, 3043
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3417
Royal commission, 4709
Railway Commission, 3188
Annual report, 1659
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3188
Constitution and work of, 3192
Railways and Canals
Bell, Major Graham A., 3195
Estimates, 1764, 3173, 3376, 3760
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648
Returned soldiers, Civil Service, 1773
Rideau canal, 4691
Royal Canadian navy, 903. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403, 3145
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Agreement with United States, 3772
Provincial undertakings, 3782
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3647
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Thornton, Sir Henry. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845
Reported statement on immigration, 2795
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 4578
Street railway, 2475
Union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Viaduct, 4325, 4336, 4452
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 893
Unrest, alleged in Western Canada, 4514
War claims adjustment, 900
War medals, 1744
Warlike stores, 900
Water powers, jurisdiction, 665
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3771, 3778
Hudson Bay railway and, 1068, 3779
Request for, 3073, 3772

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Freight Rates; Lake Grain Rates
Additional outlets for, 53
Alberta production, 1435
Bankers and, 4048
Bank liens upon seed grain and crop, 4102
Barley flour, sales tax, 4431
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 2035, 4709

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Canada Grain Act—*Con.*
Appeal, 781
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Licenses, 2299
Litigation, 2045
Canadian National Railways, 3680. *See also that title*
Cargoes, loading of. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Cheque tax charged back to farmers, 3039
Comparative rates on, 78
Crop of 1922, 20
Dockages. *See under this title,* Elevators
Drought, effect on grain production, 3429
Elevators. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Commission, qu. 1867
Co-operative, 2043
Dockages, 782, qu. 1661, 2039, qu. 3141, qu. 3505, qu. 4300
Earnings, 2042
Edmonton, 4716
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Fort William and Port Arthur, qu. 4132
Georgian Bay, qu. 620
Government, 2036, 3264
Grain Growers', 2675
Halifax, 4713, qu. 4751
Lethbridge, 4716
Montreal, qu. 385, qu. 1663, 1768, 1974, 3767
Short weight, complaint of, 2037
Multiplication of, 1400
Ontario, 2038, 4716, 4719
Overages, 494, 782, 2039
Port Arthur, qu. 4132. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Screenings, purchase of, qu. 2612, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Port Colborne, qu. 1029, 4690
Public ownership, 2956
Quebec, 2903, 3768, 4233
St. Croix, 2903
Saskatchewan co-operative, 2779
Screenings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1633, qu 1661, qu. 1739, 2042, qu. 2613, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Seed supplied by. *See* Seed Inspection
Terminal, 3821
Abuses. *See under this title,* Marketing
Fort William and Port Arthur
Dockages, screenings and scalpings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1739, 2254, 2867
Sale of, qu. 1633
Free sites, 2955
Maintenance, 810

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Terminal—*Con.*
Montreal, 1768
Price, Waterhouse, report, 2954
Profits, 2954
Vancouver, 1057, qu. 1487. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Dockages, 782
Improvement, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Exports, 2748
Flax, weed seeds and, 4378
France, pre-war production, 2247
Freight cars, shortage of, 4697
Freight rates on, 1914, 3194. *See also* Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland canal
Shipping. *See* Lake Grain Rates bill, *and under this title,* Shipment
French treaty, 455, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Gage case, 2592
Gambling in futures, 3058
Grain
Adulteration of Canadian at United States ports, 3649, 3764, 3961
Combine, 4048
Commission. *See under this title* Marketing
Loading at Canadian ports, 3974. *See also under this title,* Shipment
Mixing, 1388, 3764
New varieties, introduction, 483
Samples for exhibitions, 1454
Surveys, qu. 4131
Unsold, 273, 1975, 2748, 2773
Grain Act. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Grain Commissioners, board of, 53, 2036
Commissioners, residence of, 787
Dockage and screenings, 782
Elevator screenings, inquiry into, 2254
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Lake grain rates, 4218
Names, occupations, etc., qu. 2206
Personnel, 4221
Salaries, 4709
Grain Growers' Guide, Mr. Shaw, 987
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1763, 4710
Lawyers, employment of, 4710
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Handling of. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Hudson Bay railway 1032
India, wheat production, 1840

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Indian reserves, grain production, 1139, 2156
Injustice to western farmers, 1114
Inquiry into trade, etc. 48, 301. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 2774
Inspection. *See under this title,* Marketing
Lake Grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates Bill
Royal commission on, report, 2885
Liverpool Corn Trade Association, shortages, 1764
London Corn Exchange, adulteration, 3649, 3961
Mandscheuri barley, introduction of, 483
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Marketing, 53. *See also* Hudson Bay Railway; Markets
Costs, 68
M. (Mr. Millar) for commission of inquiry, 288 agreed to as amended, 311
Shipment and, 494
Markets, 1410
Grain unsold, 1975, 2748, 2773
Milling and baking tests, 463
Millfeeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act
Montreal
Grain shipments, qu. 1973, 1974
Shortages, 1764
Oats
Acreage and production, 2934
Price, 1388
Ocean freights. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
Overages, 494, 782, 2039. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Overhead, 1400
Pooling, 1400
Prices. *See also* Immigration; Prices
Comparison with United States. *See under this title,* Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar)
Royal commission recommended, 1209
Sample market at Winnipeg, qu. 345, qu. 494
Screenings. *See under this title,* Elevators, *and also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Seed. *See* Seed Inspection
Seed grain advances, 3444, 3447
Amount outstanding, 3444
Municipal indebtedness for, 3446
Seed purchasing commission, qu. 279
Shipment, 1032, 2854, 4193, 4714. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill *and under this title,* Wheat
Canadian and United States ports, 1756, 1767, 1768, 3764
Adulteration, 3649, 3764, 3961
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3263, 3812

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Canals, utilization of, 2808, 3763
Congestion, 3767
Quebec, 3768
Cost of, 2808, 2044
Discrimination against Canadian ports, 2960
Diversion to United States railways, 2898
Elevators. *See under this title,* Elevators
Facilities for, 730
Improvement of, 2745.
Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Hudson Bay railway, 4681. *See also that title*
Lake, 2959. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Montreal, to, qu. 385
Pacific coast, 3769
Panama canal, 1921
Portland, St. John and Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Prince Rupert, 151-2
Royal commission on lake rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3342, 3763
Shipping rates, 2517, 2613. *See also* Freight Rates
Vancouver, by, 257, 1057
Volume of, 2757
Welland canal, 3763
Wheat, Quebec, qu. 3820
Shortages
Complaints by British importers, 1764, 2037
Transportation, 19, 69, 77, 4222. *See also under this title,* Shipment
United Grain Growers, Calgary, 1408
Warehousing. *See under this title* Elevators
Western grain route, 69, 1924. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Wheat
Bounty on, 1196
Bushels required to purchase agricultural implements, 1912, and 1922, 1408
Canada greatest wheat export country, 2780
Canada third in acreage and production, 2934
Central European competition, 2396
Exports, 2750, 2774, 2780, 2843, 3062. *See also* Imports and Exports
French treaty, 1978
Hard, 2873
Markets, 3068
Marquis III, introduction of, 483
Pool, 2526

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Wheat—*Con.*
Prices, 628, 1101, 1886, 3004. *See also that title*
Production, 68, 265, 1405, 4224
Reciprocity in, 2993
Rust, 595
Saskatchewan, in farmers' hands, 1975
Screenings as feed for lambs, 2867
United States tariff against, 2823. *See also* United States, Fordney-McCumber tariff
Wheat-growing as permanent operation, 1423
Wheat stem saw-fly, 2774
World competition, 2781
Wheat board, 409, 2548, 2592, 2836, 2857, 3235
Correspondence, 626
Legislation, extension of, 2696, 2740, 2927
Order in council, 2696, 3045
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Profits, 3239
Progressive party and, 3030
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345, qu. 494

Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board

Grain Commission. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Grain Growers' Guide reference to, Mr. Shaw, 987

Grain Inquiry Commission. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Jury System
Abolition of, 2695, 3272
Combines, 2585

Grand Manan, island of
Breakwaters, 945
Population, 2172
Steamship service, 2172

Grand River, Que. wharf, 958

Grand Trunk. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Pacific. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grant, Dr. W. L., Civil Service, 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Letter to Dr. Roche, 355

Granville, Earl, Canadian Pacific Railway, 1916

Granville Island, taxation, qu. 1485

Grape-Growers. *See* Fruit; Treaties, French Treaty; Wines

Grapes. *See* Fruit

Grasshoppers. *See* Insect Pests

Gratuities. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Grazing Leases. *See* Dominion lands; Interior

Great Britain. *See also* British Preference
Agricultural conditions, 1861, 2755
Agricultural labourer's strike, 2822
Agricultural products, markets for, 2869
Agricultural representative in, 3291, 4675
Agriculture and free trade, 1858
Ammunition received from, 1740
Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824
"British policy" 4652
British preference. *See that title*
Budgets of Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2984, 3001
Canada's relations with. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties
Capital levy, 2722
Cattle
Embargo, 2871
Markets for, 208, 2871
Shipments to. *See* Live stock
Coal exports, 1263
Conditions in, 2748
Copyright legislation, 2140
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 3007
Anti-Corn law league, 1859
Bright, Mr. John, 3013
Peel, Sir Robert, 3050
Prosperity, return of, 3020
Dairy representative in, 3297
"Dangerous agitators from," 3033
Debt
Per capita, 2956
Reduction, 3072
United States to, 2879, 2918
War, 24, 2986
Deportation of Irish men and women, 3158
Depression in, 1854
Dumping ground, 2822
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Exchange, refund, 2641, 2658
Exhibitions, 1454, 1467. *See also that title*
Federation of British industries, 2726
Foreign policy, 165. *See also* Near East
Free trade, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3072, 3012. *See also under this title,* Corn Laws
Progress of movement, 3050
Rents, and, 1862
Grey, Earl, 1418
Halibut Fisheries Treaty and, 1308, 4457
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374
Immigration from, 1084, 1218. *See also* Immigration

Great Britain—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Prepaid passages, 2611
Imports and exports, 2928
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Industrial revolution, 2723
Liberty of the subject, 3158
National Farmers' union, 2791
National Labour party, policy, 2721
Naturalization. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Near East crisis. *See that title*
Necessities of life, taxation, 2789
Parliament, history of. *See* Lack of Confidence
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Precedent, 2788
Protection, 2752
Proportional representation, 392
Railways, 1618
Reciprocity treaties with France, 3050
Rural depopulation in, 1854
Shipbuilding, 3072
Surplus, 2823
Taxation, 2796
Expenditure and reduction, 2749
Income tax, 2881, 2986
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Luxuries, 3069
Necessaries, 2754
Reduction of, 2712, 4493
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2294
Trade with, 3072. *See also* British Preference
Unemployment in, 1205, 2754, 2822
War debt, 24, 2986. *See also under this title,* Debt
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Great Lakes
Disarmament
Correspondence with United States, M. (Mr. Meighen), 244, 247, 494
Tabled, 1307
Diversion of waters, qu. 3821
Shipping rates on. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates
Subsidized Steamship services, suggested extension, 2175

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Transportation Company, lease of freighters to, 3848

Great War Veterans Association
MacNeil case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Great War Veterans Association—*Con.*
Oleomargarine, 3547
Pensions. *See that title*
Petition, 4535

Greece
Grecian loan, qu. 623, 2010

Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Grenville by-election, 4606

Grey, Earl, Canada and the Empire, 1418

Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Budget, 2898. British preference, increase of; Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, 2898; railways and transportation; ports, development of; United States, railways, ports and commerce; Passamaquoddy bay, "greatest natural harbour on Atlantic coast; Canadian National Railways, ocean terminals; "Canadian export trade routed by United States ports; Senate committee's report; diversion of grain traffic; Winnipeg-St. Croix direct route; saving in transportation costs; Admiral Sir W. F. W. Owen, report, 2899; Commander Compbell, report; Captain Henry Mowat, report; Hon. Robert Rogers; examination of St. Croix harbour; Mr. E. C. Swan, report; Mr. F. C. Goodspeed, report; 2900; Messrs. Fillies, Kenney and Elliot, master mariners, reports; St. Stephen, industrial centre; advantages of St. Croix from railway point of view; Mr. D. F. Maxwell, statement of mileage, 2901; St. Croix as winter port; small cost of development; construction of railway across state of Maine, 2902; gradients; St. John Journal editorial, 2903
Canadian National Railways, 2898
Talbot, Mr. O., director, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 945

Grisdale, Dr. J. H. *See also* Agriculture department
Cattle shipment, 3040
Salary, 610

Groceries. *See* Prices

Grondines wharf, 959

Grosse Isle. *See* Health, Quarantine

Grosses Roches, Que., wharf, 968

Group Government. *See* Government

Group Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Guarantee. *See* Railways

Guessing Contests, qu. 733. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Ammunition, 884
Annuities branch, advertising, 1641
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3217
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1500
Canadian National Institute for Blind, 693
Canadian National railways, Paris offices, 3633, 3693
Cold Storage Act Amdt bill, 2057
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2139, 2288
History of legislation, 2140
Le Droit D'Auteur, 2141
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, 2060
Dominion Fuel Board, 3198
Dredging
Expenditure, 4590
Maritime provinces, 1009
Estimates, time of presentation, 4577
Field crop competitions, 603
French treaty, 2227
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238
Border states
Agreements with, 2231
Concessions to, 2402
Favoured nation treatment, 2232, 2234
Manufacturers and, 2236
Pianos and organs, 2237
Revenue loss through, 2235
Rubber, manufacturers of, 2237
Sewing machines, 2237
Summary of, 2232
Trade results, 2230
Treaty of 1907, 2229
Fruit industry, 598
Fuel supply, 797, 3198
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Grondines wharf, 959
M. to reduce item, 963
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 949
Nova Scotia, 944, 4576
Ontario, 981

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 2061
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2139
Italian treaty bill, 2402
Labour
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 2061
Strikes, 1628
Troops, employment of, 893, 1627
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, correspondents, 1626
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Linen yarns, 3897, 3898
Lunenburg harbour dredging, 4576, 4591
Amdt. to reduce amount, 4577, neg. 4580
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3314
Political partisanship, 3315
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Murray Bay wharf, 973
National Defence
Annual training, 859
Arsenal, Quebec, bonus to employees, 1751
Estimates, 859
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 893, 1627
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and contingencies, 901
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2111, 2182
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2074, 2078, 2080, 2130
Public Works
Dominon Archives, building, 1730
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Quebec riots, 893
Society of Chemical Industries, 2069
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, amalgamation, 3893
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3892
Soldier Settlement Board, Moss Mr. H. H. compensation, 2030
Supplementary estimates, lack of information, 4576, 4577
Trade and Commerce
Estimates, increase, 2033
Staff, 2031
War claims, adjustment of, 1745
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1746
Vickers Company contract, cancellation, 1746
War medals, 1743
Yarmouth harbour, dredging, 1011

Gypsum Lands. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Hackland, Capt. J., Hudson Bay route, 1064

Haggard, Sir Rider, immigration, 1206

Hail Insurance. *See* Insurance

Haileybury, armoury and post office, 4615

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Agricultural publications, 598
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855
Eight-hour day, 1650
Farming, investment to start, 1415
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4275, 4538
Hog grading, 591
Immigration
Farm labourers, 1416
Policy, 1415
Tariff and, 1416
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3554
"Plutocrats and profiteers" 1417
Senate, elective or nominative, 1378
Toronto, expenditure on public buildings, 4621

Half Breed Claims. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill; Mackenzie

Halibut Fishery Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut

Halifax
Camp Hill hospital, qu. 3506
Duties on goods shipped from Vancouver via Panama canal, 2519, 2615
Exodus from, 2400
Grain
Elevator, 4713, qu. 4751
Shipments from, qu. 1484
Immigration building, 4612
Importation through port of. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Naval college, 1744
Naval stores at, 110
Ocean terminals, qu. 4510, qu. 4713, 4751
Port, development of, 109
Quarantine station, 4612
Rockhead hospital, 4613

Halifax-Cape Breton steamship service, 2173

Halifax-Newfoundland steamship service, 2173

Halton County customs officials. *See* Customs and Excise

Hamilton
Harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Public building, 4628

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Automobile accidents, 3959
Bracebridge harbour, 4612
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4546
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
Redistribution committee, 1660
Reference to, 2884

Haney, Mr. M. J., purchase of steamer Murray Stewart, 3354

Hanging. *See* Capital Punishment

Hanna, Mr. D. B. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Director, Canada Steamship Lines, 3208
Dismissal of, 157
Insurance companies, interest in, 2050

Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Ammunition, 887
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt bill, 2048
Annual drill, 859, 863
Arichat wharf, qu. 2180
Atlantic Fisheries Commission, inquiry, 3365
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-95
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, dismissal, qu. 4511
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613
Bridges, New Brunswick, 2342
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4489
Campbellton wharf, 945
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, Moncton, transfer, 574
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4189, 4309-22
Coal purchases, qu. 4303, qu. 4511, qu. 4752
Directors, board of, 60
Dominion Express Company, contract, 2473
Express and Electric lines bill, 2471
Fredericton bridge, 3645
Grand Trunk ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 2048
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Paris offices, 3638, 3683
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Capital punishment, 768
Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, qu. 204
Carleton county, execution in, 778
Cheque tax, 3931
Chinese immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Dismissals, 856
In 1922, 3324
Civil Service Act, violation of, 1794
Coal. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Cost of, 1813
Railway rates on, 1272, 1813
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C.
Administration of Yukon territory, 2299
Appointment as commissioner, qu. 3131
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Descheneaux, Mr. P., lightkeeper, qu. 4512
Digby harbour, dredging, 4568
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 2375, 2379
Dominion arsenals, 887
East Sandy Cove, 4571
Eastern Harbour, dredging, 4569
Edmundston public buildings, site, 4613
Fishways, 3362
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1271
Geological survey, exploration, 2504
Gorman, Mr. L. F., salary, 3360
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 4562
Hayes, Mr., Canadian National Railways, 2471
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment, 2498
Highway bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Hudson Bay railway, 4310
Construction vote, 4683
Icebreaker Mikula, qu. 1384
Immigration
Child, 1471
Policy in New Brunswick, 1086
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4494, 4502
Indians, 2154
Agent at Perth, N. B., 2154
Intercolonial inclusion in Canadian National, 13
International bridges, 2342, 3647
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Joggins breakwater, 943
Kent Northern railway, 4189

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Labour
Employment bureaus, private, 1630
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4232
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouse and lightkeepers
Descheneau, Mr. P., qu. 4512
Maintenance and repairs, 3353, 3354
New lights, 3357
Salaries and allowances, 3352
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4573
Magdalen islands wharves, 974
Mail contracts
Sporting mountain, qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, Quebec, 4302
Margaree river salmon fisheries, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Maritime provinces coal, freight rates, 1813
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 2615
Meteorological service, 3360
Miramichi smelt fisheries, 1974
Moncton and Buctouche railway, qu. 203, 3646
Morrison, Mr. D. W., 1489
Murray Bay wharf, 973
Murray Stewart, purchase, qu. 203, 3354, 3359
National monument, Connaught place, 1020
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2186
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Nova Scotia, harbours and rivers, 941
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Parliament buildings, 1727
Patents of Invention bill, 2072, 2087
Permanent force, 892
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Port Greville breakwater, 944
Postmasters
Appointments and dismisals, 4534
Angouleme, qu. 3139
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, N. S., qu. 1363, 1795, 1797, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698
Herbertville, Que., qu. 3139
Labarre, Que., qu. 3138
Larouche, Que., qu. 3137
Pierreville, Que., qu. 4511
St. Bruno, Que., qu. 3140
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
St. Peter's, N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D. W., qu. 1488, 1489
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, qu. 3139
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4534
Post Office department, administration, 1817
Printing bureau, 1710
Public buildings
New Brunswick, 4613
Ontario, 4615
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1486, 2498, 2504
Rimouski wharf, 977
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1802
Russell, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebec railway, 4309
Sale and Inspection of Fruit bill 2105
Sales tax, exemption of hospital supplies, 4432
Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1369
Smelt-fishing regulations, qu. 1868, 1974
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldiers Settlement Board, staff, 2020
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Telegraph lines
Chicoutimi county, qu. 3138
St. Charles-Peribonka, qu. 3262
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment to Bench, 1868
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal qu. 3140
War claims, 2498
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Harbours. *See* Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual harbours, *See* Harbours and Rivers
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Vancouver, Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers, 993, 4554. *See also* Public Works, Dredging
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 2671
Canoe wharf, 1005
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Fraser river improvements, 1003-07
Generally, 1002
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Port Renfrew, 1008
Salmon arm, 1006
Vancouver. *See also that title*
Stanley Park, 1008
Victoria. *See that title*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Day labour, 950, 956
Expenditure, 83, 947
Generally, 1009
Manitoba, 993, 4589
Red River, 1000
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Selkirk, 1000
Wanipigow (Hole river), 1000
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
Campbellton, 945
Cummings Cove, 945
Generally, 946
Grand Manan, 945
Head Harbour, 2900
Passamaquoddy bay, 2899
Portage river, 950
St. Andrew's, 2899
St. Croix, 2899
St. John. *See that title*
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Wharves transferred to Dominion government, 946
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Abbott's harbour, 4563
Advocate, 4560
Annapolis Royal, 941
Arichat, qu. 2180
Bass River, 4563
Battery Point, 4563
Black Point, 941
Broad Cove marsh, 4564
Burlington Centre, 4564
Canada Creek, 4564
Canso, 941
Cape St. Mary, 941
Cariboo Island, 4564, 4567
Chapel Cove, 941
Cheverie wharf, 4567
Chimney Corner, 941
Culloden, 4567
Dartmouth, 4568
D'Escousse, 4568
Digby, 942
Dredging, 4568
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Eastern Harbour, 4569
Ecum Secum, 4571
Five Islands, 4571
Fruid's Point, 4571
Generally, 942
Gillis Point, 4571
Grand Narrows, 4572
Half Island Cove, 4572
Halifax. *See that title*
Hampton, 4572
Haulover, 943
Inverness, 4572

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Joggins, 943
Judique, 943
Leitche's Creek, 943
Little Anse, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4722, 4572
Little Harbour, 4575
Livingstone's Cove, 4576
Lockeport, 943
Lunenburg, 4576
Dredging, amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580
Malagash, dredging, 4580
Margaree, 4581
Margaretville, 4581
Meteghan, 4581
North Ingonish, 4582
North Sydney, 4582
Nyanza wharf, 4582
Ostrea Lake, 943
Parrsboro, 4583
Pembroke, 4584
Pictou, 4584
Beach light, 4583
Piper's Cove, 4583
Point Aconi, 4583
Port Beckerton, 4583
Port Greville, 944, 4583
Port Lorne, 4584
Portugese Cove 4584
Riverport, 4584
Round Hill, 4584
Sandford, 4584
Scotch Cove, 4584
Scott's Bay, 4584
Shaw Bay, 4585
Shelburne, 4585
Sheet Harbour West, 4585
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Ship Harbour, 4586
Smith's Cove, 4585
Sonora wharf, 4585
South Lake, 4585
Summerville, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Yarmouth, 944
Ontario, 2690, 4588, 4594
Bayfield, 981
Belle River, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Big Bay Point, 981
Blind River, 981
Bracebridge, 4612
Chatham, 982

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Cloud Bay, 982
Cobourg, 981
Fort William, 2675, 4610
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Generally, 982
Grassmere, 4612
Jackson's Point, 4589
Kincardine, 982
Little Current, 982
Meaford, 983
Midland, 983
Owen Sound, 2690
Port Arthur, 2675, 4610
Port Burwell, 983
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Port Maitland, 4589
Rondeau, 983
Southampton, 984
Toronto, 2678. *See also that title*
Prince Edward Island, 945
Beach Point, 4586
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Quebec
Bryant's Landing, 950
Cap de la Madeleine, 950
Chicoutimi, 950
Contrecoeur, 950, 1008
Cross Point, 955
Descente des Femmes, 955
East Templeton, 955
Generally, 968
Grand River, 958
Grondines wharf, 959
M. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 963
Grosses Roches, 968
La Malbaie, 968
Lanoraie, 969
Lavaltrie, 969
L'Islet, 969
Matane, 970
Montreal. *See that title.*
New Carlisle, 973
Peribonka, 973
Piche Point, 973
Pointe a Elie, Magdalen islands, 974
Point au Pic, Murray Bay, 973
Pointe aux Trembles, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) 977
Quebec harbour. *See that title*
Repentigny, 977
Rimouski, 977
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Riviere du Lievre, 978
Roberval, 978
St. Alexis, 980

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Ste. Anne des Monts, 979
St. Charles, 980
St. Jean d'Orleans, 980
St. Michel de Bellechasse, 980
St. Omer, 980
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Three Rivers, 3399, 3963. *See also that title*
Ville Marie, 981
Saskatchewan, 1001, 4589
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winter ports, 2902

Harington, Sir Charles. *See* Near East Crisis

Harness, duty on, 3048

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582-3
Budget, 2804. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Bank Act revision; tariff; former criticism of minister; irritating taxation; sales tax; increase passed on to consumer; application to foreign and domestic goods, 2804; encouraging the middlemen; dilemma of the Minister of the Interior; free trade and protection; cost of civil government; balanced budget; Civil Service salaries; duplication and overlapping of services; retrenchment; ship of state drifting; Liberal party near rocks of destruction; immigration policy, 2805; government on business principles; tariff stability, protection and free trade; indigenous industries; wood production; reciprocity with United States; a begging request; parliamentary speeches; brevity, 2806; shipment of cattle to British markets; Transcontinental railway; Winnipeg-Quebec route; shipping facilities; Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats for cattle trade; St. Lawrence river waterway, parliamentary discussion of, 2807; talk of secession in western provinces; breezes blowing in the mulberry trees; national and imperial unity, 2808
Canadian National Railways
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Directors, inspection trip, qu. 489
Special train, qu. 489
Experimental farms, 467, 472

Harris, Mr. Joseph H.—*Con.*
Feed inspection, 602
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4589
Health of animals, 582
Hog cholera, 582
Jackson's Point wharf, 4589
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, Stornoway, 2181
Montreal harbour commissioners, advances, qu. 812
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 4753
Retired farmers, income, 1118
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Toronto viaduct, qu. 517
Trade commissioners, 1840

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 958

Hatters Bands, etc. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Haulover, N.S., wharf, 943

Hawkesbury, government revenue and salaries, qu. 2205

Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal from Calgary post office, 1687, 1868

Hazelton telegraph line, 150

Hazen, Sir Douglas
Appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Health. *See also* Housing; Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Advancement of, 2827
Children, mortality of, 1179
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Death rate, 1197
Department of
Estimates, 697, 2170
Food and Drugs Act, administration, 697
Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Institutions for sailors, 2167
Legal adviser, 777
Maple products, 1810
Marine hospitals, 2167
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Grosse Isle, number of vessels calling, 2168
Halifax building, 4612
St. John, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Health—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Sick mariners' dues, 2167-8
Dominion Council of Health, women members, 3649
Medical research, standardizing and testing laboratories, 703
Immigration, medical inspection, 702
Oleomargarine and, 3558
Pharmaceutical preparations, country of origin, qu. 3261
Venereal diseases, 705

Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live stock

Healy, Mr. A. F. (North Essex)
Belle River harbour, 4594, 4608
Canadian Press Limited, 2555, 2630, qu. 3703
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Combines bill, 2555, 2621, 2630
Registrar, appointment of, 2630
Introduction, 1135
Newspaper combines, 2630
North Essex election, visit of Mr. Meighen to Belle River, 4594

Hearst Publications. *See* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)

Hebert River coal district. *See* Coal

Hebridean Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Hector Celebration, grant to Scottish Pioneer Association, 4636, 4705

Helium, discoveries
Macallum, Dr., 4439
McLennan, Professor by, 703

Hemp
Belfast, 3032
Bounty, 2647, 2659, 2704, 2709, 2778, 2823, 2827, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3018, 3031, 3911, 3963
Binder twine, 2780
Extension of time, 3911
Duty, 3017
Industry, establishment of, 3031
Seed, for agricultural purposes, 3474
Free entry of, 2645, 2651

Hemp Bounty Bill
Res. 3911, 3914, 3963; lr., 3963; 2r., com., 4376; 3r., 4391
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4376, neg. 4391

Henderson, Right Hon. Arthur, class rule in politics, 2733

Herbertville, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3139

Herschell Island, Eskimos, trial. *See* North West Territories Act Amdt.

Hides, imports, qu. 617

High Commissioner in London
Empire settlement board, agreement, 1476
Grain shortage, complaint of British importers, 1764
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Office building, 4629
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., representative on Pacific Cable board, 1832
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456

Highland Battalions. *See* Hector Celebration

Highways. *See also* Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill
Alberta, 2342
Appropriations under act of 1919, 2338
Banff-Windermere, 3437, 3584
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
British Columbia, 2941, 3186
Unemployment, 3032
British Columbia-Washington state, 2941
Buckhorn lock roadway, 4691
Canada Highways Commission, 2489
Campbell, Mr. A. W., C.E., 3173
Staff, 3173
Canboro-Dunville-Welland-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Cariboo road, 3032
Cost per mile, 2491, 3176
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Dundas street, qu. 708
Effect on railway traffic, 1619
Estimates, 2489, 3173
Federal contribution to, 2489
Grants
Federal inquiry, 519, qu. 623
Ontario, to, qu. 620
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 624, 2492
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 813
Hope-Princeton, 2342
Indian reserves, passing through, 2153
International, 2941
Bridges, 2342
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Jasper Park, 3435
Lachute-Arundel, 4313
Manitoba, 3184
Meaford-Clarksburg, 4565
Millbrook reserve, 2124
Montreal-Hull, 2341
Montreal-Mont Laurier, 2341, 4313
New Brunswick, 3182

Highways—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 3183
Ontario, 3177
Grant, qu. 620
Projected, 624
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 2085
Pacific highway, 2341
Prince Edward Island, 3184
Quebec, 3180
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Saskatchewan, 3185
Statements
Cost per mile, 3176
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Types of roads, 3174
Toronto-London, qu. 708
Waterton lakes, qu. 2085
Yukon, 3943

Hindus. *See also* Immigration, Oriental Immigrants, franchise, 503, 4077, 4640-53

Hirtle, Carrie L., schooner, qu. 3323

Historic Sites. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Canadian National Parks and Reservations bill; Monuments and Memorials

Hoboes, products of unemployment, 1194

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Annuities, old age, 1697
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Belle River harbour, 4597
British mail, delay in, 2639, 2695
Business, difficulties of, 1419
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4190
Paris offices, 3279
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Combines bill, 2522
Co-operative associations, 1419
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4558
Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 335
Hamilton harbour commissioners qu. 912
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hemp bounty, 3911
Hudson Bay railway, 4192
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3590
Policy, 1418
International Joint Commission, 3427
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour, hours, 1842

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
Canadian, encouragement of, M., 826, 855
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Midland post office, qu. 623
Montreal harbour commission, qu. 1137
National Monument, Connaught place, 1021
Navigation, aids to, 3333
Newspaper combines, 2522
Paper, prices in Canada and United States, 829
Peat experiments, 794
"Plutocrats and profiteers," 1418
Post Office department
Appointments and retirements, 1826
Ross, Mr. George, retirement, 1825
Progressive party and tariff, 1421
Proportional representation, 388
Public ownership of railways, 4190
Public Works department, patronage, 946
Quebec harbour commissioners, qu. 1136
Radio direction finding, qu. 3820
St. John harbour commissioners, qu. 911
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2780
Sales tax, 4414
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Tariff
Immigration and, 1418
Reduction of, 1421
Toronto
Customs house, 3279
Harbour improvements, 2679
Seed branch building, 4624
Union station, 4444
Viaduct, 4444
Vancouver harbour bill, 264
Vancouver harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Welland canal construction, 3780

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 186
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs., trip to South America, qu. 1031
House of Commons furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Address in reply, 63. No reference in speech to tariff revision, 63; rapid deflation in price of foodstuffs; market for surplus farm products; Canadian agriculturist to-day feeding Europe, 64; Canadian representation in the United States; foreign policy bound up in that of United States; conference of provincial representatives on revenue; amendment, 65

Hoey, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 999
Authors' Association of Canada, copyright, 3155
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4038
Bank robberies, 776
Binder twine, prices, 4377
Brandon, damage by floods, 999
Cadet services, 877
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3961
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 565
Civil Service, exempted positions, 367
Copper bounty bill, 3235
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155
Dominion Elections Act amdt. 1027
Experimental farms, 462
Farm homes, 1215
Grand jury system, abolition of, 3271
Hemp bounty, 3912, 4377
Hopkins, Mr., and reciprocity, 3010
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1215
Policy, 1213
Story of an immigrant's struggle and success, 1216
Inheritance tax, 2803
Institutionalism, over, 1214
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225, 4227
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4175
League of Nations, 142
Manitoba
Agricultural economic conditions, 1213
Institutions and services in excess of present need, 1214
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Proportional representation, 406, 418, 424
Reciprocity with the United States, 2854, 3905
Rural credits, 4039
Settlement schemes, 1089
Shipping combine, prosecution of, 4077, 4227
Taxation commission, 4039
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Western provinces, conditions, 1213

Hogs. *See* Livestock

Holland
Butter, competition, 2863
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration, from, 1085, 1095, 3591
Imports and exports, 1977

Home Building. *See* Building; Housing

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697, 1810

Hong Kong, goods imported via Suez canal and, 3454

Honorary Advisory Council. *See* Research

Honours. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, Labour Gazette, 1625-6

Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supply, 1263

Hopkins, Mr. E. N. (Moose Jaw)
Budget, 2980. First speech in House of Commons; limited vision of new members; Canada's destiny; Moose Jaw district; selection of wheat by millers; high tariff bears unduly on the West, 2980; interests of the East and West; recapitalization and adjustment of debts; sharing of war burdens, 2981
Introduction, 2417
Moose Jaw income tax office, qu. 2699
Reciprocity, attitude towards, 3010

Hoppe and Isenberg Leases. *See also* Dominion Lands Act (Coal Leases); Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill
Cancellation of, 3146, 3222
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Investigation into, 3128

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse-Racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Information. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bills

Horses. *See* Live stock

Horticulture. *See also* Fruit; Insect Pests
Canadian Council of, 2307
Garden and grass seeds, purity of, 601
Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423
Nursery stock, 1990
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Seed testing. *See* that title

Hospitals. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Health
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Marine, 701, 2167
Military, 669
Closed, 669
Brant House, Burlington, 4075
Euclid House, Toronto, 4075

Hospitals—*Con.*
Military—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
Repairs and improvements, 4629
Staffs, 675
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Transients, treatment of, 673
Sales tax, 4432
Soldiers, maintenance cost, qu. 812
Standardization, 2934
X-Ray plates, coverings, duty, 3501

Hotel Scribe, purchase of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hotels. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hours. *See* Civil Service; Labour

House of Commons. *See also.* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1721, 2446. *See also under this title,* Audibility of debates
Members, speaking, to occupy central position, 1721
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven o'clock, 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3208, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
To await action of Senate on bill, 4754
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
British Columbia fishing licenses, M., (Mr. Clark), 1540
Hebridean immigrants, M. (Mr. Speakman) 3584
Powell River Paper Company, M. (Mr. Neill) 2886
Union Bank, M. (Mr. Forke) 4296
Twelve, midnight, 4672
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Audibility of debates, 645, 976, 2446, 3327, 4572, 4580, 4593
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Bills
Alterations in, 3325, 3451
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3974, 3976, 4185
Preparation and form of, 4007
Principle discussed on second reading, 3091
Private, suspension of rules, posting, 4248
Third reading by consent, 4141
Business of the House, 179, 250

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Amdt. to amdt.
Mr. Crerar, session of 1922, 1300
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1299-1307
Budget debate, precedence, 2694
For to-morrow, 3750
Government orders to have precedence Monday and Wednesday, 1158
Legislation
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
Pending, qu. 2517, 2795, 3265
Announcement, 3452
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Post Office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' days, 1158
Progress of, 2469
Supply. *See also under this title,* Supply
Calling on Mondays and Tuesdays, 2295
Relevancy, 4720
By-elections, 99. *See also* Elections and, *under this title,* Vacancies
Grenville, 4606
Moose Jaw, return, delay, 2295
North Essex, 4594
Chamber
Acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics;
Conversation, 4528, 4572
Lighting, 1728
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Canadian Government Merchant Marine vote, 4598
Committees, For proceedings and reports, *See titles* of the several committees
Expenses of, 2691
Reports
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Right to consider questions not referred to, 3266
Select Standing, 3, 199
Changes in membership, 382, 486, 435, 615, 811, 857
Special, cost of, 2979
Contingencies, 2691
Debate
Audibility of. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility
Speeches
Brevity, 2806
Length of, 2883
Debates, Official Report of
Abolition, 1734
Committee, 202

House of Commons—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of—*Con.*
Distribution, 1715
Estimates, 2691
Insertion of documents not read, 1830, 3174
Pages missing from bound copy, 887, 1081
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Revised edition, inquiry, 122
Undiscussed items in supply, 1638, 3284, 3292
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Divisions
Address in reply
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) neg. 178
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Shaw) neg. 177
Bank Act Amdt. bill
Bank charters, extension, amdt. (Mr. Good) 4141, neg. 4147
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Officers, right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Budget
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means agreed to, 3084
Canadian National Railways bill (Branch lines) amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to 3r., neg. 4401
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) for repeal; amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for Special Com. agreed to, 571
Combines bill, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for 2r., agreed to, 2609
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Robb) for concurrence in amdt. agreed to, 2292
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to supply neg. 2391
Export Act Amdt. bill (Pulpwood) amdt. (Mr. Power) six months hoist, neg. 4397
French Treaty bill, M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., agreed to, 2250-51
Lack of Confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) neg. 243
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill M. (Sir Lomer Gouin) for 2r., agreed to, 4180
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) to permit manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) to remove suspension of prohibition, agreed to, 3581

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that government submit legislation before prorogation, neg. 3580
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 434
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment of, neg. 1152
Titles, Honours and Decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) neg. 1299
Documents, distribution of, 1712
Estimates, 2691. *See also that title;* Supply
Discussion
En bloc 4554, 4558, 4587, 4612
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614-15
Furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Indemnity of members, 4674. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Proposed reduction 2915, 2967, 3043
M. (Mr. Leader) 1153
Senate and House of Commons Act, proposed changes, 4007, 4008. *See also that title*
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Joint Committee of both Houses on matters of common interest, 4007. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611
Report, 3887
Language, unparliamentary. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Letters
Quotation from by private member, 4599
Signature withheld, 4599
Library of Parliament, salaries, 2691
Members
Alleged reflection on, 4237
Attendance, 4007, 4008, 4236. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Coaching each other, 405
Deceased, 10, 102, 166
Blackadder, Dr. Edward, 4-8, 102

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Kennedy, Hon. W. C., 4-8, 10, 102, 166, 281
Lafortune, Mr. D. A., 4-8, 281
Stewart, Hon. J. A., 4-8, 435
Indemnity of. *See under this title,* Indemnity
Labour, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033
New, election and introduction of
Benoit, Mr. A. J., 3
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., 2837
Finn, Mr. R. E., 3
Healy, Mr. A. F., 1135
Hopkins, Mr. E. N., 2417
Preston, Mr. R. F., 3
Rheaume, Mr. J. F., 3
Roberge, Mr. Eusebe, 3
Robichaud Mr. J. G., 3
Party funds, and, 4237
Relationship with constituents, 3021
Sessional attendance. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Stenographers, qu. 518
Votes, 4237
Motions. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Amendment to amendment
Proposed change in rules, 856, 1299
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Precedence, 3451
To keep place on order paper pending Speaker's ruling, 1285
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the day. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Parliamentary counsel, Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Privilege
Bancroft, Mr.—Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner), 1308
Béland, Hon. Mr.—Reported statement of Mr. Meighen in North Essex election, 708
Carroll, Mr.—Com. on Agriculture and Colonization, 3266
Clark, Mr.—Equalization of railway rates, 1910
Coote, Mr.—Correction of newspaper report, 2519
Good, Mr.—Question of veracity, 2181
Irvine, Mr.—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Martell, Mr.—Civil Service Committee report, 4363
Shaw, Mr.—Grain Growers' Guide, 987

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr.—Redistribution Committee, 1660
Questions
Answers and, 1385
Inquiry as to, 940
Lengthy, 939
Passed as orders for returns, 938, 940, 1139, 1385, 4303
Placed on order paper without member's knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Representation. *See* Redistribution
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Alleged incomplete, 1307
Inquiry for, 1212, 1636, 2208, 2254, 2394, 2640, 3324, 3508, 3962, 4184, 4295, 4513
Tabled, 3399
Rules
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Special committee to consider, M. (Mr. Johnston) 856, 1299
Suspension of, private bills, 4248
Wednesday, hour of meeting, Rule 2, 1
17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Senate and, Joint Committee. *See* Senate
Sergeant-at-Arms, estimates, 2691
Session
Economy in length of, 132, 133
Waste of time in, 143, 144
Sittings. *See also under this title,* Adjournments
All night, 4672
Late, 4599
Midnight, 4579, 4672
Mornings, 4132, 4249
Saturday, 2694, 3452, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Change in hour of meeting, 1
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Speaker's rulings. *See also* Speaker
Discussion of, 4013, 4076
Speeches. *See under this title,* Debate
Staff
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Organization, 4592
Salaries, 2691
Translators, Arsenault, Mr. H. P., 2691
Supply
M. to postpone proposed resolution, 3667
Voting in, 4610, 4611
Vacancies. *See also under this title,* By-elections
Cape Breton North and Victoria, 1763, 2469
Moose Jaw, 615
Nicolet, 2178

House of Commons—*Con.*
Votes and proceedings, questions passed as orders for returns, 939

House of Lords, constitution of, 1378

Housing. *See also* Building; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Assistance for, 2987
Building trades and, 1812
Farm homes, 1178, 1215
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1215, 1240, 1406
Harvesters, 2822
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 2517, 2518
Loans to provinces, 4558, 4603, 4704

Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2393, 2347, 2419, 2469, 3155

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4082
Budget, 3060. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity with United States; sugar duties, reduction in; tariff stability; review of fiscal system; national policy and its results; comparison of imports 1879 and 1923, 3060; new inventions, standards and wants; imports increasing in spite of high tariff; United States, Fordney tariff; iron ore and smelting industry; Canada not a self-contained country; imports must be paid for by exports; products of farm, sea and forest; manufactured products, export of, 3061; United States market; free admission of boots and shoes and farm implements; Canadian manufacturers, after 40 years protection not able to compete; folly to encourage new industries by artificial means; new duties and bounties; sectionalism; solidarity of the West; tariff and unjust tax; wheat production; producers get no benefit from tariff; Liberal platform of 1919; no hope of tariff planks being carried out; vote against government tariff proposals, 3062
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, grain trade, 1211
Rules, 1301. M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com. on
Tariff proposals, vote against, 3062, 3084

Hudson Bay
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Resources. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Company
Claim to Rocky Mountain park, qu. 2418
Navigation of Hudson bay and strait. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways, branch lines; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland Canal
Agricultural resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Appropriation of land for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Canadian air force, 1748
Climatic conditions, 1072
Coal, transportation of, 1055, 1073, 1283
Cochrane, Hon. Frank, statement by, 1071
Commercial feasibility. *See under this title,* Feasibility
Commission to inquire and investigate, 3005
Comparative distances, 1034, 1070
Competition with Canadian National Railways, 1041, 1050, 1056, 1058, 1067, 1973-4
Construction, 4680
Correspondence, 208
Discontinuance of, 1062, 2747
Deficit, operating, 1560
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1062, 1761, 4682
Expenditure, 1033, 3073, 3076, 4192, 4198. *See also* Welland canal construction
Public and, 3005
Experiments, 461
Feasibility, 1033-70, 1749, 2878, 2939, 3005
Anderson, Captain, 1038, 1042, 1044, 1057, 1064
Bartlett, Capt, 1047
Bell, Dr., report, 1052
Bernier, Capt., testimony, 1072
Chisby, Capt., report, 1052
Crean, Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1072
Gordon report, 1038
Hackland, Capt. J., statement, 1064
Investigation by Canadian air service, 1749-50
Kennedy, Capt. William, report, 1052
Low, Mr. A. P., report, 1072
MeKenna, Mr. J. A. J. report, 1063
Manitoba legislature, com., report, 1052
Pritchard, Capt. William, report, 1052
Reid, Capt John, 1046
Test of, 1069
Tyrrell, Mr. J. W. report, 1072
Wakeham report, 1038
Finance, 1053
Dominion lands, appropriation for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Lash, late Mr. Z. A., 1053
Oliver, Hon. Frank, statement, 1053
Fishery resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Fort Churchill terminal. *See under this title,* Terminals

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1061, 1072
Freight rates, 3779. *See also that title*
Graham, Hon. George P., statement in 1916, 1071
Grain, transportation and marketing, 1032-80, 4681. *See also that title*
Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, 1061
Hazen, Sir Douglas, 1061
History and condition of, 1040, 1076
Hydro-electric power, 1065
James Bay railway, 1036, 1049
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4170
Land sold for qu. 283. *See also under this title,* Finance
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid
Announcement of project at Niagara Falls, 1047
Statement, 1066, 1071
London Times 1059
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co. claim, 4686
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
Military aspect of, 1057
Monthly Trade Review, London, editorial, 1036
M. (Mr. Knox) for consideration of Senate report, 1032; agreed to "on division," 1080
Motherwell Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686, 2774, 4683
Obstacles to success of, 2939
Policy, 2878
Port Nelson. *See under this title,* Terminals
Postponement of, 2951
Press statement as to cost—correction, 2296
Priority of undertaking, 1073, 1079
Progressive party and, 3030
Rail removals qu. 203
Reclamation of land in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Repair, 1070, 3647, 4198, 4680
Resources Hudson bay and region, 1039, 1064, 1072
Agricultural, 1065
Crean Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Fishery, 1064, 1073
Lower, Mr. A. R. M. report, 1065
Melville, Mr. C. D. report, 1064
Sifton, Sir Clifford announcement of project at Brandon, 1047
Surveys and gradings, 4310
Terminals, 1071
Bartlett, Captain, 1063
Fort Churchill, 1039, 1043, 1063
Hazen Sir Douglas, statement, 1063

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Terminals—*Con.*
Port Nelson, 1032, 1037, 1039, 1043, 1063, 1069, 3647
Dredging, 1012
Reid, Hon. J. D. statement, 1063
Thornton, Sir Henry, 4683
Turgeon, Hon. Senator, 1071
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Utility of, 1076
Waterpowers, 1065
Welland canal and, 1054, 1068, 3779. *See also that title.*
West, interest in scheme, 1035
Work this year, 4310

Hudson Bay Route, feasibility of. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply 123. Financial question; social and industrial unrest, 123; transportation and the railway problem, 126; contrast between government railways and Canadian Pacific, 127; Prince Edward Island railway, 128; decrease in population of Prince Edward Island, 129; representation of Prince Edward Island on government commissions, 130; discrimination in freight rates, potato-growing; immigration; the eight-hour day, 131; hours of railway station agents, 132
Budget, 2919; Multiplicity of counsel; mild criticism of budget from opposition benches, 2919; taxation and debt; responsibility for; increase of expenditure by Conservative administration; civil service dismissals and appointments; war prices; 50 per cent of war expenditure wasted or stolen, 2920; Liberals associated with late government; purchase of medical supplies through middleman; Conservatives preach economy but propose no specific reduction, 2921; reciprocity with United States; offer by Sir John Macdonald; election campaign of 1891; statement of Mr. Blaine; protection and free trade; balance of trade; imports and exports, 2922; international trade, profit and loss; artificial trade barriers; trade commissioners and subsidized steamship services; war blockade; selling without buying 2923; defeat of reciprocity in 1911; world-wide free trade not attainable; high tariff unprofitable; revenue necessities; farmers and reciprocity, 2924; legislation in advance of public sentiment; Liberal platform of 1919; progressive opposition, amendment, 2925

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 531
Amdt. to refer to special committee, 534
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Morning and Saturday sittings, 4132
Powell River Paper Company, 2893
Proportional representation, 419, 423

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Budget, 2940. Congratulations to Finance Minister; western provinces, lack of knowledge of; British Columbia, resources, 2940; Asiatic immigration; highways; electors of Revelstoke and Nelson; Mr. McQuarrie's charge of bribery, 2941; Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; immigration; fruit-growing industry; returned soldiers, treatment of; discontent; Canadian Legion, Victoria, B.C. resolution; administration of Pension Act, 2942; Board of Pension Commissioners; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, withdrawal from Nelson; telegram of Nelson Board of Trade; professional agitators; copper bounty, 2943; Trail smelter; opening of copper rod mill; optimistic feeling in British Columbia; tariff; amendment, 2944
Canadian National Railways, legislation, qu. 4300
Canadian National Safety League, 3958
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-37
Copper bounty bill, 3241, 4373
Freight rates, equalization of railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1970
Hindu franchise, 4658
Housing
Administration of act, 2171
Loans to provinces, 4704
Imperial Conference, 4658
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour, right to organize, 2895
Ore-testing, Ottawa plant, 2505, 2511
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3282, 4748
Pensions, 2942
Appeal boards, 697

Humphrey, Mr. L. W.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Royal commission
Interim report, 2167
Recommendations, 2394
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 4734

Hungary, immigration from, 1094

Hunter, Mr. J. B. *See* Public Works Department

Husband's Brother, Marriage with. *See* Deceased, Marriage

Huskisson, William, tariff reduction in Great Britain, 3050

Hydro Electric Power. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Beck, Sir Adam, Morrisburg dam, 1270
Development in Ontario, 1270
Electric railways, 2475
Municipalities, 2475
Pointe Fortune, qu. 1974
Power exported to the United States, 1266
Quebec and New England Hydro Company, qu. 1974
Whitney, Sir James, 1266

Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 3782
Public ownership, 3056
Radial railways, 2476
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324

Hydrographic Survey. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Ice and Icebreakers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries; Vessels
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Cabot strait, obstruction in, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3354

Iceland, immigration from, 1096

Illicit Liquor Traffic. *See* Liquor

Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Immigration, 2784, 3060, 3066. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Labour, Unemployment; Naturalization
Advertising, 43, 81, 1084, 1085, 1103, 1180, 1218, 1318, 1873

Immigration—*Con.*
Agents
Appointment of, 1188
Biden, Miss, 1099
Bowder, Mr. W. R., representation of New Brunswick in Great Britain, 1086, 1198
European, 1876
Gardiner, Mr., 1099
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085, 1135, 1243
May, Mr., 2663
Murphy, Mr. representative in Scotland, 1095, 1879
Pattullo, Mr., 1096
Railways acting as, 1191
Agriculturists of, 37-38, 1881. *See also under this title,* Farmers
Alien enemies, restriction of, 1128, 2428, 2667
Alleged campaign against, 332
Appointments, 3252. *See also under this title,* Agents
Army officers, 1432
Artisans, shopkeepers, town dwellers, 1204
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental
Assimilation, 1346
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Assisted passages, 1096, 1132
Great Britain, from, 1100
Immigrants family or friends, advance, 1100
Loans for passages, 1475-8
Banks and, 4042. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Barnado Boys' home, 1099, 1470
Beatty, Mr. E. W. and, 1337-8
Belgium from, 1096, 1173
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister, visit to England, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Boundary inspection, 1875
Bracken, Premier, statement, 1123
British, 20, 43, 1084, 1105, 1218, 1339, 1346, 2929
Preference for Australia and New Zealand, 2932
British Columbia into, 1096, 1112, 2942
Co-operation with, 1097
Oriental, 1217. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Buildings
Halifax, 4612
St. John, 1457, 1464
"Canada an immigration sieve," 628, 647
Canada Colonization Association, 51, 71, 1089, 1118, 1133, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1191, 1208, 1215, 1237, 1240, 1315, 1352, 1357, 1396, 1391, 1399, 1425, 1428, 1437, 1439, 1479, 3637

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Advances, qu. 517, 1479
Advertising, 1318
Agreement, 1879, 3036
Signing of, 1976
Terms, 1102
Amery, Colonel, 1328
Brown, Mr. M. A., 1102-3, 1172, 1328
Letters from Messrs. Meighen and Forke, 1333
Budget expenses, 1877
Calder, Hon. Senator, voluntary colonizing agency, 1333
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, contribution, 1164
Canadian National Railways, 3324
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3324
Commission, 1877
Community clubs, 1183
Crawford and Kurdydyk, Messrs., letters, 1396
Creelman, Mr. George, manager, eastern Canada, 1172
Dennis, Col. J. S., statement of, 1324
Everett, Mr. Edward, manager, 1092, 1103, 1172
Forke, Mr. Robert, director, 1407
Letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Statement by, 1105
Grant, 1877
Hebridean immigrants, 3585
History of organization, 1102
Imperial government, financial support, 1429
Land, sales of, 1316, 1431, 1877
Commission of ten per cent, 1102
Interest rate, 1877
Selection and purchase, 1091
Luse Land Company, 1103
McRae, General, 1324
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Minister's statement, 1320
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Officers and directors, 1327
Proposals, memo of, 1877
Published statement of objects, 1180
Railway contributions, 3400, 3633
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Salvation army, 1093
Soldier Settlement supervisors, services of, 1090, 1877
Speculation in unimproved land, 1118
Subscriptions, 1877
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1172, 1182, 1323, 1328, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Willison, Sir John—*Con.*
Letter to directors, 1431
Retirement from presidency, 1164, 1332, 1431
Telegram, 1325, 1331
Withdrawal of financial support, 1208
Canadian born, 3032
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876
Central, southern and eastern European, 1346, 1883
Child, 1099, 1227, 1243, 1342, 1469, 1472, 1475
Agencies, grants to, 1469, 1470
Barnardo, Dr., 1099, 1470
Bilbrough-Wallace, Mrs., 1470
Cardinal Manning, 1470
Catholic Emigration Association, 1470
Cossar, Dr. George C., 1471
Inspection, 1874
Marchmont Homes, 1470
Middlemore, Sir J. T., 1470
National Children's home and orphanage, 1470
Oriental, 1445. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Quarrier, Mr. William, 1470
Rye, Miss 1470
Salvation army, 1470
Smart, Mr. Bogue, 1469
Statistics as to 1470
Chinese. *See under this title,* Oriental
Colonization, 1178, 1333
Eastern provinces, 1134
Societies, 1876
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Competition and, 1418, 1426
Conference with railway and shipping companies, 1193
Conservative administration under, 1335-6
Co-ordination of activities, 2800
Co-operation, 1255
Cost of, 1439
Crerar, Hon. T. A., statement, 1123
"Dangerous agitators from British Isles", 3033
Denmark, from, 1096
Department. *See* Immigration and Colonization
Deportation, 1875
British soldier, alleged inhuman treatment, 2254
Deserters from ships, 2435
Discrimination between native-born and immigrant, 2732
Distribution of, 1198

Immigration—*Con.*
Domestic servants, 1099, 1115, 1166, 1189, 1200, 1243, 1474, 1475-6, 1477, 1876
Doukhobors, 1176
Settlement and migration, 1340
Drift to cities, 1165-1171, 1342
Economic conditions and, 1231
Emigration, *See that title*
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 1096, 1111, 1120, 1127, 1132, 1175, 1205, 1237, 1328, 1480
Canada's non-co-operation, 1096
Canada's participation, 667
Grant
Agreement, 1461, 1464, 1469
Division of, 1475
European, 1085, 1094, 1170, 1340, 1346, 2748
Agencies, 1876
Assimilation of, 2749
Northern European, 1227, 1249
Southeastern European, 1195
Exhibitions, 1454
Expenditure, 1908, 2969
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Total, 1208
Farm labourers, 1100, 1115, 1166, 1174, 1187, 1188, 1190, 1200, 1358, 1416, 1475
Farmers, of, 1115, 1188, 1189, 1421
Farmers' Advocate, 1186
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Follow-up policy, 1181
Foster homes for children. *See under this title,* Child
Fowler, Senator, statement by, 3032
France, 1173
German and Hungarian immigrants, 1094
Growth of West due to, 1881-2
Hebridean, 2950, 3037, 3252, 3584, 4706
Canada Colonization Association, 3585
Macdonnell, Rev. Father, 3585
Settlement in valley of Red Deer, 3252
Treatment of, M. (Mr. Speakman) to discuss etc., 3584, withdrawn, 3603
"Hidden Hand," the, 1167, 1193, 1201
Hindu, 498, 1120-8. *See also that title*
Franchise, 503, 4077, 4640, 4655
Iceland, from, 1096
Immigrant's struggle and success, 1216, 1399
Immigrants, rejected, qu. 706, qu. 1992
Imperial government, and, 1328
Increase of, 3055
Indian army officers, 1096
Intending immigrants to make application. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
International Labour Conference, 1631
Isle of Man, address by Mr. F. W. Kerr, 2949
Jacobs, Mr., speech at Winnipeg, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental
King, Mackenzie, Mr., speech at Stouffville, 1430
Labour. *See also that title*
Attitude of, 1167, 1176, 1186, 1193, 1196, 1241, 1337, 1892-3
Competition with, 2816
Employers and, 1193, 1194
Howat and Meyerscough, detention. *See* Howat; Labour
Restriction of, 1104
Land, 1091, 1102. *See also* Dominion Lands
Adjoining railways, 1893
For American immigrants, 1093, 1101
Sales, appraisal, 1316, 1431, 1877
Settlement, 2834
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156. *See also* Howat
Literature, 1097-8, 1226, 1239, 1389, 1414, 1428, 1433. *See also under this title* Advertising; Propaganda; Publicity
Misreprensentations, 1203
Lloyd, Bishop, reported statement, 1117, 2844
Loans for passages. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Overseas settlement board, 1469, 1481
Location of immigrants, 2834
London Times
Advertisement, South Africa, 1180
Statement of, 1124
Lougheed, Sir James, statement by, 3032
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 1204
Maritime provinces to, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236
Ignoring of, 2950
Mechanics from the Clyde, 1204
Medical inspection, 702, 1875
Mennonites, 1176, 1229, 1341, 1884
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1170
National Trust Company, statement of president, 1122
Naturalization, 2196. *See also that title*
Netherlands, 1095, 3591
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Nomination system, 1360, 1475-8
Non-English speaking immigrants, 1216
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Officers in Great Britain, 1879. *See also under this title* Agents
Ontario, into, 1096-98, 1428, 1475
Child immigration and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Northern, into, 1097, 1320
Oriental, 1117, 1247, 1307, 1346, 1443, 1900, 2941, 3037. *See also* Imperial Conference
Bill respecting, 4441

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Bishop of New Westminster, on, 504
Chinese, 499, 1443, 1448, 4641. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission, statistics, 1921-22, 1445
Assimilation, 2321
Children, 1445, 1452, 2484
Education of, 1896
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Estimates, 1443
Exclusion, 2313
Fingerprints, 502
Head tax, 1445
Evasion of, 2309
Indentured labour, 2330
Japanese and, 1117
Liberal platform of 1919, 1652
Merchants, 2309
Definition of, 2329
Students and, 1445, 2308, 2310
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2319
Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike, 2319
Registration, 502, 1445, 1447, 1452
Regulations, 1445
Religious organizations, representations from, 2310
Roosevelt, the late Theodore, statement, 2320
Sailors, 2333
Schools, 2326
Silverton, B.C., public meeting, res. 2338
Tong wars, 2337
Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1896
United States, 2313
Victoria retail merchants, 2316
Wives, 2484
Women, 2310, 2318
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1161
Estimates, 1441, 1443
Exclusion of, 2869
United States, from, 1194
Hindu, 498, 1120, 1128. *See also* Hindus, Franchise
Franchise, 503, 4077
Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa
Letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Visit to Canada, 4641
Japanese, 1450, 1894, 4641. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Birth rate, 1898
British Columbia, menace to, 1900
Canadian Japanese Association, pamphlet, 1894
Citizenship, 2442

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Japanese—*Con.*
Consul General at Ottawa, pamphlet, 1894
Correspondence with Mr. McQuarrie, 1894
Direct, 1448
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
"Gentlemen's agreement" 512. *See also under this title,* Lemieux agreement
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 859, 1448, 1451, 1454
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Lemieux agreement, 1894
Modification, 1447
Limitation of, 1449
Merchants, 1452
Nationality, 2443
Naturalization, 2442
Negotiations with Japanese government, 2328, 4441
North American Commission of American Legion, pamphlet, 1898
Petition of W. J. Bartlett and others, 2837, 4075
Irregular, Speaker's ruling, 2885
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Race equality, 1896
Restriction of emigration by Japanese government, 2328
Rights as British Subjects, 1899
Root-Takahjira "gentleman's agreement" 512
Supposed special privilege to land holders, 1450
Merchants, definition of, 1452. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Naturalization, 1453
Ormsby-Gore, Mr. W. G. on Canadian policy, 1111
Overcharging, Quebec, 3324
Overseas Settlement Board, 1099, 1469
Agreement, 1476. *See also under this title,* Empire Settlement Scheme
Passage. *See* Assisted Passages
Paternalism, 1133
Permission to intending immigrants. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Poland, 1204
Policy, 19, 29, 42, 1095, 1120-30, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1461, 2774, 2805, 2816, 2833, 2844, 2869, 2874, 2911, 2949, 3036
British dominions, 1882
Comment of London Times on, 1111
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 1177

Immigration—*Con.*
Population. *See also that title.*
Loss of, 3018
Not increased by, 1195
Prepaid passages, agreement with Imperial government, 2611. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1407. *See also* Prices
Printing, 1873
Private enterprise, 1414
Progressive members, attitude of, 2774
Propaganda, 1192, 1389. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Publicity
Embracing all Canada, 1098
Oriental, 1894-6-8
Prosperity and depression, 1177
Provinces
Co-operation of, 1085
Other than western, discrimination against, 1097
Provincial governments and, 1327
Publicity, 1873. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Propaganda
Advertisements, cost of, qu. 518
Committee, 1871
Special writers, 1874
"Public charge" 3155
Qualifications of immigrant, 1882
Quebec, into, 1104, 1198
Railways acting as agents, 1191
Recruiting, 2834
Repatriation, 1085, 1188, 1198, 1876, 2834
French Canadians in United States, 1462
Restriction of, 1169, 1174, 1186, 1233. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Orders in council, 1128
Russia, 1340, 2845
St. John immigration building, 1464, 1908
Agreement with C.P.R., 1458
Salvation army, 1093, 1430, 1876
Saskatchewan
Domestic servants, 1099
Mennonites, 1229
Scandinavia, 1216
Scotland from, 1095, 1876
Scottish Aid Society, 1876
Selection, 1098, 1108, 1219, 1254
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Settlements far removed from railways, 3431
Shaw, Lord, statement in Winnipeg, 2833
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Sifton, Sir Clifford
Importation fo British workmen, 1186
Policy, 1204, 1881-83

Immigration—*Con.*
Smart, Mr. Bogue, child immigration, 1469
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1255. *See also under this title,* Canada Colonization Association
Extension of system to immigrants, 1128
Supervisory agents, 1179
Speeches
Adverse effect of, 1423
"Blue ruin," 3037
Standards of living, 1127
Statistics, 3036, 3055
1881-1922, 1094
1914-1921, 1111
1920-22, 1105
Steamship companies, bonuses to, 1109, 1462
Stornoway immigrants, 3037. *See also under this title* Hebridean
Supplies, Quebec, 496
Alleged overcharging, 3324
Sweden and Holland, from, 1095, 3591
Switzerland, 3591
Tariff and, 1133. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation and, 1121, 1319, 2791. *See also* speeches on Budget
Thirty-two year payment plan, 1317
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1167 2795, 2844
Trade
Effect upon, 1122
Relations with oriental countries, 507
Ukrainians, 1341, 1396, 1883
Unemployment relief, 1679, 2730
Union Nationale Francais, 1877
United Farmers of Alberta, res. 81
United Farmers of Ontario, res. 1191
United States. *See also that title*
Agencies, 1875
From, 43, 1105, 1113, 1243
Unskilled labourers, 2822
Vancouver immigration sheds, 1896
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981. *See also* Japanese
Walker, Sir Edmund, 1343
War years, during, 20
Western Canada, 1086, 1347
Attitude of, 107, 1086-92, 1129
Western Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Canada Colonization
Women's immigration division, 1876

Immigration Act Amendment Bills. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
1. Permission to intending immigrants (Mr. Neill) 1r., 74; order for 2r. stands, 497, 857

Immigration Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
2. Alien enemies; fines, shipmasters reporting desertions (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1r., 2204; 2r., com., 2428; com., 2668; 3r., 2671; Senate amdts., 3981
Sections and subjects discussed
British subject, 2429
Canadian citizen, definition, 2429
Canadian domicile, 2429
Deportation, 2429, 3981
Conspirators, 2428
Without trial, 2433
Deposit as security for return of deserters, 2435
Discharging crew without examination, 2435
Enemy aliens, 2428, 2667
Repeal of 1919 legislation, 2428
Undesirable classes, 2428, 2668
Aliens, 2428, 2667
Assassination, 2669
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981

Immigration and Colonization department
Chief Controller, 2308
Chinese immigration, salaries, 1443
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Statement of expenditure, 1480
George, Little, deportation, qu. 3704
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Little, Mr. W. R., employment, qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Minister
Reported statement, Sir Henry Thornton, as to, 2795, 2844
Statement of, 1082
Outside service, salaries, 1082, 1106, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386
Quebec employees, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Transfers, qu. 3141
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) to reduce, 1441, neg. 1441
Staff transfers, qu. 2517
Travelling expenses of inspectors, 1874

Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638
Opportunity for, 3059, 3223, 3453, 4250

Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Agenda—*Con.*
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled, 1991
British North America Act, right to amend, 4660
Canada's status, 4664
Canadian autonomy, 4651
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4664
Commitments, 3059, 3223
Conferences of 1917 and 1921
Cattle embargo, 26
Smuts, General, 72
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4660, 4661
Discussion, forecast of, 3453. *See also under this title,* Agenda
Egyptian policy, 4662
Embargo on breeding cattle, 3291
Expenses of delegation, 4638
Foreign relations, 4659
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 508, 4077, 4640
Imperial Federation, 4661
Imperialism, 4655, 4656
Militarism, 4652
Naval Service, 4654
Policy, 3453
Preferential tariff, 4661. *See also* British Preference
Publicity, 4665
Purchasing power of money, 4666
Reparations, 4653
Report inadequate, 4662
Representation of Canada, 1686
Resolution of Mr. Mackenzie King in 1921, 1535
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, 3822
Treaty of Versailles, modification of, 4653
War, Canada's participation, 4655

Imperial Economic Conference, 4666
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638, 4666
Opportunity for, 3453, 4250
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled 1991
Expenses of delegation, 4638, 4666
Representation of Canada, 1686

Imperial Federation, British labour party and, 4651

Imperial Oil Company. *See also* Oil; Petroleum bounties
Gasoline, price of, 2547

Imperial Relations. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties

Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Imperial Veterans of Canada, petition, 4536

Imperialism. *See* Imperial Conference

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Importation of Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Customs and Excise

Imports and Exports, 2401. *See also* Agriculture; British Preference; Budget; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French, Italian
- Agricultural products, 445, 1390
- Balance of trade, 2922
- Beans, 2981
- Binder twine, 2965
- Coal, 1226. *See also* Coal
- Comparison of 1897 and 1923, 3060
- Direct. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty
- Exports
  - Agricultural machinery, qu. 814
  - Agricultural products, qu. 814
  - Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Canada's best customer, 1838
  - Cattle to United States, 1410, 2910
  - Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Electric power, 658. *See also that title*
  - Export trade, 1838
  - France to, 1977, 2213. *See also under* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Gold, 4249
  - Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
  - Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper
  - Potatoes, qu. 621. *See also that title*
  - Products of farm, sea and forest, 3061
  - Pulpwood. *See* Export Act Amdt.; Pulp and Paper
  - Settlers' effects, 20-21
  - Wheat 2774, 3062. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
    - Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
- Fishery products, 445
- France, 2210, 2230. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Grain, 2748. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
- Great Britain, 2928. *See also* British Preference
- Home markets, 2869
- Imports
  - Agricultural products, qu. 617, 1246, 2917, 2958
    - United States, from, 2708

Imports and Exports—*Con.*
- Imports—*Con.*
  - Animals and animal products, 445
  - Butter, 2821
  - Canned vegetables, 445
  - Coal, qu. 490, qu. 516, 2828. *See also that title*
  - Direct, 2898
  - Duty collected, 2838. *See also* Customs and Excise
  - Eggs from United States, 2708, 2821
  - Farm produce, 1426
  - France, from, 1977
  - Fresh and dried fruits, 445
  - Marking, 931
  - Panama canal, via, 1921
  - Potatoes, 2820
  - Raisins, qu. 2699
  - Sales tax on, 4409
  - Silks, 445
    - France, from, 2397. *See also* Treaties, French
  - Tobacco, qu. 1258
  - United States from, 2820. *See also that title*
- Increased, 2936, 3055
- United States, 2929. *See also that title*

Income Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. Bill (Chief occupation; interest on borrowed capital; deductions for expenses; incomes of consuls and consuls-general; penalty against employer; appeals; taxes; prior lien; indebtedness to taxpayer; distress in default of payment; pension exemptions). Res. 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4508
- Sections and subjects discussed:
  - Act to come into force, 4508
  - Certificate of default to be registered as judgment, 4506
  - Collection of tax from third party, 4506
  - Decision of minister, notice of dissatisfaction with, 4505
  - Income from chief occupation, 4504
  - Taxes to be a lien, 4505

Indebtedness. *See* Bank Act Amdt.; Budget; Finance; Loan; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons; Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Independent Commissions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

India
Automobiles, export to, 508
Canadian trade commissioner in, 1840
Grain production, 1840
Hindu franchise, 4077. *See also* Imperial Conference; Hindus
Immigration of army officers from, 1096

Indian Affairs department. *See this title under* Indians

Indians
Agents
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, 2151
Local, 2146
Perth, New Brunswick, 2154
Wootten, Mr., 2154
British Columbia, 2152, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2125, 2145
Education, 2164
Brandon, 2147
Edmonton school, 2149, 2164, 2165
Elkhorn school, 2147
Kamloops, 2146, 2152
Morley reserve, 2150
Oblate Fathers, 2145
Red Deer school, 2164
Residential schools, 2164
St. Albert school, 2149
Sarcee reserve boarding school, 2145
White Bear reserve, 2162
Farming, 2156
Fishing, grazing and wood permits, qu. 706
General, 2163
Great Slave lake and Mackenzie districts, 2145
Hospitals, medical attendance, 2145, 2160
Hunting grounds, 2146
Indian Affairs, department
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Live stock, 2162
Manitoba, 2145-7
Medical service, doctors, 2145, 2160
New Brunswick, 2124, 2153
North West territories, 2145-7
Nova Scotia, 2124, 4702
Ontario and Quebec, 2124 2146
Peguis, Saulteaux chief, monument, 4704
Potlatching, gaol sentence for, 2163
Preservation of, 2151-52
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Rations, 2148
Relief, 2125
Reserves, 2124
Blackfeet, 2148
Prices charged, qu. 3142

Indians—*Con.*
Reserves—*Con.*
Blood, 2159
Carleton, 2162
Caughnawaga, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
File Hills, 2145
Grain production on, 1139, 2156
Greater production, 2150, 2155, 2156, 2162
Highways passing through, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Moose Mountain, qu. 706
Muscowequan, 2156
Nipissing, 1307
Perth, N. B., 2154
St. Peter's, 2153
St. Pie, fencing, 2154
St. Regis, 2163
Sarcee, 2125, 2145
Six Nations, 1307, 2148
Tobique, timber cutting, 2154, 2155
Turtle Mountain, 3413
White Bear, 2162
Saskatchewan, 2145-7
Sioux, 2160
Round Plain band, 2162
Starving, 2125
Statement by minister, 2145
Titles, extinguishment of, 3398. *See* Dominion Lands Act bill
Tuberculosis, 2152
Western Canada, 2145

Indictable Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils, Joint. *See* Labour

Industrial Designs. *See* Trade Mark and Designs Act

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Application for boards; pending proceedings) 1r., 1361; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2063; Senate amdts., 4357, 4592
Sections and subjects discussed:
Industrial towns, 2889
Judges on conciliation boards, 4358

Industrial Problems, credit and. *See* Credits

Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Labour; Textiles; Trade
Agricultural prosperity and, 2962
Annual production, statement, 2720
Basic
Adequate protection 2822
Assistance to, 3238. *See also* Bounties
Wool-combing, qu. 1973. *See also* Wool
Bonused, 3072
Capital diverted from by income tax, 2914
Conservation of, 2820
Control of bank directors, 4022, 4023
Democracy in, 2727
Encouragement of, 2958
By artificial means, 3062
Farmers and, 2853
French treaty, effect on, *See* French Treaty
Indigenous, 2779, 2806
Industrial centralization, 2850
Industrial conditions, 636, 3002. *See also* speeches on Address, Budget
Industrial revolution, 2723
Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891
Closed town system, 2888
Industry and finance, 4053
Investigation of by tariff commission, 2955
Joint control of, 1654
Key, 2752
Labour costs, 2876
Lack of in western provinces, 4047
Manufactured products
Exports, 3061
Value of, 2934
Manufacturing
Costs, 1409, 2720
Labour organizations and, 1857
Overhead, 2928
Production and distribution, 3029
Establishment in West, 1405
New, assistance to, 2780
Prices of agricultural and industrial products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Primary, relief, 2718
Protected, 2798, 2957
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
St. Stephen, N.B., 2901
Salaries, average, 2720
Small industries, disappearance of, 2850
Tariff and, 3024
Wages, average, 2720
Watered stock, dividends on, 2956
Western Canada, 1889
Wood-working, 2806

Inflation and Deflation. *See* Finance; Money; Prices

Ingram, Mr., appointment. *See* Immigration

Inheritance Tax. *See* Taxation

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise
Illicit stills, remission of fines, 2299
Postage stamps, used for, 3938. *See also* Post Office

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bills
1. Excise duties changed; cigarette duties
Res. 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4392; 3r., 4393
2. Certificate of analyst; deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol; home-grown tobacco
Res. 3749; 1r., 4131; 2r., com., 4207; 3r., 4208; Senate amendments, 4528
3. Certificate of analyst, etc., order discharged, 3969

Insect Pests, 595. *See also* Agriculture; Forests and Forestry
Alfalfa weevil, 596
Apple sucker, 596
Browntail moth, 596
Cereal rust, 595
Codling moth, 597
Cornborer, 595
Cut worms, 4632
Grasshoppers, 595, 3447
Gypsy moth, 596
Nursery stock, 596
Potato diseases, 595
Satin moth, 596
Spruce bud worm, 596
White pine blister, 595

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Insolvent Cases. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Inspection of Seeds. *See* Seeds

Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Institutionalism, excess of, 1214, 1400, 1890. *See also* Hoey; Immigration; Speakman

Insulin Treatment, discovery. *See* Banting, Dr.

Insurance. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Returned Soldiers
Agents, bank officials acting as, 4093, 4094
Bank loans, security, 4094
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Combinations, 2591
Fire, soldier settlers, 496
Grain cargoes, 3764, 4219, 4223
Hail, 2769, 4095, 4509
Hail Insurance Commission of Saskatchewan 2770

Insurance—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 2050
Insurance branch
Annuities, old age, 1697
Salaries and contingencies, 3987
Live Stock condemnation, qu. 1972, 2699. *See also* Live Stock
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., director, 2050
Mutual companies, 4095-7
Roof coverings, 4703
Soldier Settlement Board, Edmonton, 3506
Soldiers. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance bill

Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. Bill
(Duplication of returns; automobile insurance; correction of French version)
1r., 3045; 2r., com., 3147; com., 3977, 4357; 3r., 4357
Sections and subsections discussed:
Accidents to persons or property, 3978
Application, 3148
Automobile insurance:
Conditions of license for, 3147, 3977
No liability:
If driver under age limit or intoxicated, 3978
Unless stated in policy, 3978
Exceptions to insurability, 3148
French version amended, 3147
Misrepresentation, 3147
Returns of British or foreign unlicensed insurance, 3147

Intercolonial Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Intercontinental Transports Limited, ocean freight rates, 2127

Interest. *See* Banks; Credits; Finance; speeches on Budget

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Concurrence, 1482, 1538

Interim Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Interior, Department of. *See also* Geological Survey
Astrophysics
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, Victoria, 3242
Expenditure, 3243
Campbell, Mr. R. H., retirement, 3410
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, salary, 4667
Dominion observatories, 3242

Interior—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, 3406
Canadian National Parks and historic sites, 3938
Contingencies, 3408
Engraving maps, printing reports, 3443
Estimates, 1908, 3242, 3406, 4702
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3252
Grazing leases, Alberta, revenue, qu. 2515
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Mines branch, 2970
Officials, 1108
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Reclamation
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 3949
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, 3447
Topographical surveys, 3244
Water powers, surveys, investigations, 3420

Interlocking Directorates. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundaries
Survey and demarcation, 3246

International Court of Justice, 3994

International Fisheries Commission. *See* Fish and Fisheries

International Harvester Company, 4376

International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Wheat production, 2780

International Joint Commission. *See also* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Lake of the Woods water powers, 3425
Pollution of boundary waters, 700, 3362
St. Lawrence river waterway, aerial survey, 1776, 3762, 3427
Welland canal, 3762

International Labour Conference. *See* Labour

International Law, violation of. *See* Germany, Reparations

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, United States lines

International Postal Conference, 4529

International Questions, opportunity for discussion, 3993, 3998

International Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations; Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Interprovincial Trade. *See* Trade

Interstate Commerce Commission. *See* United States

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Liquor

Inventions. *See* Patents of Invention

Inverness pier, 4572

Investigations. *See* Combines Bill

Ireland
Proportional representation, 395
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Iron and Steel. *See also* Customs Tariff Items; Mines and Minerals
Bounties, 4371, 4381
British industrial development, 3847
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994
Freight rates, 1964
French treaty, 1985, 1988
Iron and steel scrap duty, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Iron ore and smelting industry, 3061
Ore-production and smelting, 3061
Rolled iron and steel
Hoops, bars, etc., duty, 3484
Milling cutters, for, 2653, 3484
Steel-workers strike, 287. *See also* Labour, Strikes
United States, production, 2751

Iron Ores. *See* Mines and Minerals

Irrigation. *See also* Dominion Lands, Reclamation
Alberta, 1436
Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
British Columbia, 457
Central Alberta irrigation scheme, 3428
Drought effect on grain production, 3429
Expenditure, 2969
Lethbridge irrigation district, 3429
Macleod irrigation district, 3429
Northern Saskatchewan, 3430
Surveys and inspections, 3428
United irrigation projects, Cardston, 3429
William Pearce irrigation project, 3430

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Mining rights of lease holders)
1r., 1992; 2r., com., 2138; 3r., 2204

Irvine, Mr. William (Calgary East)
Audibility of debate, 645
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4037, 4049, 4082, 4118
M. that chairman leave chair, 4125
Shareholders' audit, 4089
Bank mergers, 4137
Banking system, 634
Cadet services, 880
Calgary
Post office building, 1024
Unemployment relief, 1682
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3387, 3397
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3650, 3662
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Capital punishment bill, 180, 487
Opportunity for consideration, 1810
Children, mortality of, 1179
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction, 914
Examinations, 366
Credit and industry, M. 626, 645, 650
Criminal Code Amdt., capital punishment bill, 180, 487, 1810
Customs and excise seizures, qu. 620
Dredging, 1012
Duff, Mr., amendment to Address, 117
Economic conditions, cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Emigration to the United States, 1178
Employers' liablity compensation, 692
Farm homes, building loans, 1178
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 333
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1176, 1177
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3600
Policy, 1176-80
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706-7
Senate amendments, 4362
Interest rate, 4107, 4116
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Labour department
Capitalistic, 1674
Staff, reduction, 1672

Irvine, Mr. William—*Con.*
Labour
Representation in House, 3556
Right to organize, 2888
Lack of confidence vote, M., 208, 239-243
Land, taxation of, 1178
Lignite Utilization board, 387
Mail contractors, names, 3144
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment and qualifications, 3311, 3295
Redistribution, 3313
Two Ministers of Agriculture, 3313
Money, origin and function, 633
National gallery, 1020
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2688
Nova Scotia strike, troops employed, 495
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3555
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854, 4750
Postal appointments, 1801
Powell River Paper Company, 2888
Privilege—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 414
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1022
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679
Scientific and industrial research, qu. 731
Secession—reported statement of Hon. W. F. Roberts, 3145
Single tax, 1178
Soldier Settlement board, 1179
Steamship services, 3378, 3387, 3397
Unemployment, 628
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Relief, 690, 1679
Vetcraft shops, 695
Western conditions, cause of, 1890

Isenberg Leases. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Italian Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Italy
Senate, constitution of, 1372
Tariff. *See also* Treaties, Italian Treaty
Trade, 2395
Treaty with. *See* Treaties
Wool-combing, 2866

Ivel, Mr. W. M. *See* Redistribution

Jackson, Professor, price chart, 1403

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
American fishing schooner Siloam, capture, 2207

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Arsenals, Quebec and Lindsay, 2165
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4050, 4052, 4056
Point of order, 4055
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1515
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3086-3108 3211-21
Belle River harbour, 4596
Binder twine, duty, removal of, 4387
Board of Audit bill, 4357
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1160
Saturday sittings, 3452
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408 2413
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3832
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 4335
Paris offices, 4514
Canadian representative in United States, 3085
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr. Duncan Marshall, 2614
Civil Service Act. M. (Mr. Power) 547
Combines bill, 2628
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Registration of ownership) 615
Deputy minister of Immigration, 668
English and French-speaking people, 1341
Halibut fishery treaty, 1309
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 514, 4077, 4640
Immigration
Alleged campaign against, 332
Assimilation, 1117
Canada Colonization Association, 1164
President, 1092
Exodus to United States, 1165
Farm labour and domestic servants, 1165
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Labour, attitude towards, 1167
Medical inspection, 702
Policy, 1163-71
Restriction of, 1169
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 514, 2428-35
Legislation of 1919, 243-32
Ships' crews, 2435, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4640-4661
Indians
Caughnawaga reserves, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
Edmonton school, 2165

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4359, 4361
King George and race-track betting, 728
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement in North Essex, 670
Money, purchasing power of, 1167
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2189 2195, 2438, 2461
British system, 2438
Judical and executive authority, 2462
Limited naturalization, 2461
Nationality, dual, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2461
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 700
Printing, outside Bureau, cost of, qu. 3131
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 957
Railway Act Amdt. bill (return tickets) 615
Receipt tax, 4425
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
Sales tax
Book or account, 4434
Licensed manufacturer, 4421
Speech at Winnipeg, 1429
Standard of living, 1168
Thetford Mines strike, 2207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Unemployment, 1168

James Bay Railway, 1036, 1049, 1402
Coal, transportation of, 1073

Japan
Bean-growing industry, 2982
British-Japanese relations, 2470
Canadian naturalization, 2442, 2461, 2467
Competition from, 2861
Expatriation from, 2443
French treaty, 3035
Immigration. *See also that title*
Restriction by Japanese government, 2328
Imports and exports, 1978, 2255
Japanese consul general
Immigration, 1447, 1894
Pamphlet, 2443
Japanese fishermen, 4484. *See also* British Columbia
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Military service, 2443
Mizusawa, Mr. Kosaku, alleged intervview, 1899
Nationality, 2442
Negotiations with, 4441
Rights of foreigners in, 1895
Silks, 2397
Trade concessions to. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Japan—*Con.*
Trade with, 2214, 2234. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Trade treaty with, 1449, 2399
Wool-combing, 2866

Japanese. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration

Japanese Fisheries Association, 1453

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Accredited herds, 586
Agricultural credit system, 1438
Alberta
Grain production, 1435
Irrigation, 1436
Live stock, 1435
Southern, conditions in, 1435
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4113
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3438
Cost of living, burdensome to farmers, 1437
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Freight rates, equalization of, 1437
Grain dockage and screenings, 786
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1437
Policy, 1435
Interest rate, 4113
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3429
Lethbridge elevator, 4716
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Oil prospecting and development, 780
Petroleum bounties, 780
Public buildings, rents, 1025
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 927
Timber wolves, 597
Tourist traffic, Southern Alberta, 3438

Jobbers
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Joggins, N. S., breakwater, 943

Johansen, Mr. F., assistant zoologist, 3360

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moose Jaw)
Certificate of registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Sales tax collections, qu. 285
Status of, inquiry, 202

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agriculture, weed menace, 1887
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4097
British preference
Increase in, 2243
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2777

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred—*Con.*
Business of the House
Amdt. right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Private members' day, 1159
Rules, amendment of, M. for special com. 856, 1299, 1300, 1306-7
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4307
Grand Trunk, gratuities to directors and officials, 1666
Civil Service Act, special committee, names, 2417
Crowsnest pass agreement, statement that Progressives had forced concession, 2855
Dunblane-Aylesbury branch line, 4308
French treaty bill, 2242
Income tax, revenue, 3027
McMaster, Mr., statement of position, 3030
Nova Scotia secession resolution, 2243
Reciprocity with United States, 2243
Redistribution, 4740
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee report, 4740
Royal commission on lake rates, report, printing, 2927
Rules, M. for committee, 856, 1299, 1306-7
Seed grain advances, 3447
War claims, 2495
Waterous-Swift Current branch line, 4308
Wheat Board
Legislation, request to extend, 2927
Proceeding under Act of 1922, 1636
Yorkton-Willowbrook branch line, 4308

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Joint Peat Committee. *See* Fuel

Jolly Roger, the, 2787

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
St. John river wharves, qu. 1488
St. Margaret's bay road, qu. 3135
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Joynson-Hicks, Sir William, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill; Judges Act Amdt. bill; Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Admiralty. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.
Appointments, 3349
County court, naturalization certificates. *See* Naturalization
Industrial disputes conciliation boards, 4358
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Naturalization. *See that title*

Judges—*Con.*
Ontario and Quebec courts. *See* Judges Act
Pensions, qu. 492, 1154
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029, 1154
Political commissions, 3604
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Salaries
Pensions and, 1154. *See also* Judges Act
Total payments, qu. 491
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868
York county, 3607

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
(Salaries; Circuit Court judges)
Res. 3264, 3452, 3603; 1r., 3608; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610
Sections and subjects discussed:
Additional $1,000 to judge of Circuit Court, 3610
Arbitrators or assessors under Railway or public act, 3609
Judges, Supreme Court of Ontario, 3609

Judique, N.S. wharf, 943

Jugo-Slavia, Italian treaty and, 2396

Jurisdiction. *See also* British North America Act; Labour, Unemployment; Lake of the Woods; Provincial Rights
Bankruptcy Act, 3095
Combines. *See that title*
Disallowance of provincial statutes
British Columbia, Chinese immigration, 1161, 1261, 1453
Nova Scotia, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Drainage, 3256
Education, 882, 1884
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1646
Labour, 1442, 1646, 1650, 1618, 2894
Lake freight rates, 4227-31
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Unemployment, 1657, 1678
Water powers, 3421

Jurors, not British subjects. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Jury. *See* Grand Jury

Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Capital punishment, 768. *See also* Criminal Code
Department
Correspondence—Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2299
Employees, number and cost, 2970

Justice—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Deputy minister
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' case, 2521
Salary, 4671
Estimates, 705, 768, 4667
International Labour Conference, 1442
Salaries and contingencies, 780, 4667
Solicitor General, retirement of, 1763, 1764, 1810, 2710
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Executive clemency, correspondence, 1975
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Minister of, absence, 4514
Parole, release on, 1975
Pecuniary claims convention, 780
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Dorchester, qu. 494, 770
Earnings of inmates, 772
Nationality of inmates, 772
Prince Albert, Brenner, Meyer, release, 1975
Stony Mountain, 771
Trial of Eskimos charged with murder, Herschel Island, 4674

Kahn, Mr. Otto H., Elements of Success, 1399

Kamloops
Indian school, 2146
Public building, 1006

Kay, Mr. W. F. (Missisquoi)
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
Carroll, Mr., and, 3268
Oleomargarine, 3268
Reports
First, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock bill, 1441
Baker Memorial Com. report, 1256, 1991
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 4669
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4669
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4541
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3519
Amdt. 3520
Privilege—Mr. Carroll, 3268

Kay, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome, 4012

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Address in reply, 106. Condition of country; inauguration of industrial epoch, 106; farmers in the West and immigration policy, 107; duty of government to see fair play, 108
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027, 4099-4103, 4133, 4139
Mortgages and hypothecs amdt. 4099 withdrawn, 4133
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
British preference and Canadian ports, 2678
Budget, 2809; commendation of Minister of Finance; tariff stability; interpretation of term; speech of Minister of Agriculture; allegation of bad farming; amendment; British preference; comparative statement of rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809; speech of Minister of the Interior; Progressive party, assumption of power by; capitalistic interests and political parties; inheritance tax; reciprocity with the United States, 2810; agriculture, conditions of; budget; business and financial depression; "calamity howlers"; unsatisfactory conditions in West, 2811; disappointing record of Liberal party; no difference between Liberal and Conservative parties; invisible government; financial control; selfishness of those controlling destinies; prices and the tariff; interest rate; freight rates; charges of professional men; purchasing power, reduction of; conditions in the West; allegation of bad farming and extravagance, 2812; professional men, charges and standards of living, earnings of farmers; ridicule and intimidation of the West, 2813; government out of sympathy with people; Progressive party, predicament of; attention to demands of West, 2814
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National railways, wage reductions, qu. 1363
Copper bounties, 3239
Crude petroleum duty, 3481
Dental instruments, raw materials, 3484
Deputy ministers, retirement, qu. 3135
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4364, 4368

Kellner, Mr. Donald F.—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3252
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Dredging, Plamondon, Alberta, 1013
Farming at a profit, 81
Field supervisors, soldier settlement, 1090
Free trade and protection, 2923
Grand Trunk arbitration, commissioners, qu. 624
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3595
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1352
Personnel, 1092
Policy, 1348
Wealth and, 1122
Inland revenue officers, salaries, qu. 3892
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Live stock, tuberculin test, qu. 1972
Merchants bank inquiry, 3990
Solder settlement, 2024, 2027
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Western provinces, conditions in, 1349

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Bacon imports and exports, 938
Business of the House, 1386
Canadian air force, forest patrol, 1778
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship service, 2172
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, construction of, 1185
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Lifting of steel, 1664
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (scrip frauds) 730
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3430
Grain Act, litigation, 2045
Grain shipments, facilities for, 730
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Health department, salaries, 2170
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1180
Statement of objects, 1180
Supervision, 1092
Community clubs, 1183
Immigrants, standard of living, 1127
National land settlement plan, 1181
Policy, 1180, 1401
Indians, 2148
Labour Gazette, 1624
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Mackenzie river district, half breed claims, 3444
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speeches in Great Britain, 3595
Peace river district
Railway surveys, 4701

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M.—*Con.*
Settlement in, 1184
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Purchasing Commission, 1385
Railway Act Amdt. bill, (Equalization of rates) 730
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833, 1834
Scrip frauds, 730
Soldier settlement, 2028
Steamship services, 2172
Northern Alberta, 2176
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Water powers, investigation, 3426

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Agricultural conditions, 1843
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 376
Dairy Industry Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, renovated butter, 4510
Dairying industry, 1843
Exhibitions, 1454
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4620
Health department, salaries, 2170
Indian Affairs department, salaries, 2166
Labour department, employment officers. 1674
Military hospitals, 677
Pensioners, medical examination, 677
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3288
St. Lawrence river islands, St. Regis reserve, 2163
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Kennedy, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C.
Belle River harbour, 4597
References to, 4, 6, 8, 10, 54, 108
Letter of thanks for sympathy from Mrs. Kennedy, 281

Keynes, Mr. John M., on war, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations
Economic Consequences of the Peace, 2724

Kincardine, Ont., pier, 982

King, His Majesty the, race-track betting, 728

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Armouries, fittings, etc., 1024, 2413
Bamfield public building, 1024
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1556

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Calgary post office, 1024
Calumet-Bryson bridge, 1014
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 536
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Dominion roads and bridges, 1014
Dredging
Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1012
Expenditure, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009
Nanaimo harbour, 1014
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Shuswap lake, 1014
Victoria harbour, 1014
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583, 3979
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
Fraser river improvements, 1006
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Graving docks, 2682
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers, 2671
British Columbia, 1002
Stanley park foreshore, 1008
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Manitoba, 993
New Brunswick, 945
Grand Manan, 945
Wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675
Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012
Quebec, 950
Grondines wharf, 959
Matane, 970
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hydro Electric commission, St. Lawrence development, 2682
Lake Manitoba flooding, 1000
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Laurier monument, 1017
Law, the late Bowan B., tablet to memory, 1020
L'Islet wharf, 970
Matapedia birdge, 1014
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
Moose Jaw public building, 1023
National Gallery, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Okanagan lake wharves, repairs, 1008

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Parliament buildings, 1716
Acoustics, 1721
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723
Stone carving, 1720
Tower, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Port Burwell harbour dredging, 983, 1012
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Member for, 2681
Sewerage outlet, 994, 998
Printing bureau
Improvements, 1022
New building, 1732, 1738
Public Works
Engineering branch, 1017
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 2571
Patronage, 945
Public buildings, 2690
Dominion archives building, 1730
Economy, renting or building, 1735
Local improvement taxes, 1023
Maritime provinces, 1022
New departmental, 1729
Ottawa, Daly building, 1023
Ottawa Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also under this title,* Parliament buildings
Power, 1025
Printing bureau new building, 1730
Rents, 1025
Salaries, 2684
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 950, 955
Quebec, Champlain dock, 2675
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1954
St. John harbour improvements, 2676
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., appreciation of, 1006
Selkirk, repair slip, 1000
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Swift Current public building, 1023
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682
Toronto harbour improvements, 985, 1011, 2678
Toronto island protection breakwter, 984
Vancouver harbour bill, 267
Vancouver island telegraph lines, 1017
Victoria and Nanaimo harbours, dredging, 1014

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Victoria
Dry dock, 1002
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Wharves
Revenue, 975, 977
Transfer to Dominion government, 946

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2908. Felicitations to Finance Minister; tariff; automobiles; Henry Ford greatest customs collector in Canada; tariff "purely and simply protective"; Liberal platform of 1896; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on tariff reduction and Senate reform; Liberal party repeating tactics following election of 1896; influences preventing government from carrying out pledges; Progressive party, withdrawals from; capital levy; reciprocity; new sources of revenue; luxuries; inheritance tax, 2909; reciprocity with United States; advantages of enlarged trade; diversity of products; treaty of 1854; abrogation of and its results; reciprocity in natural and manufactured products; manufacturing opportunities in Ontario and Quebec, 2910; President, Massey-Harris Company "ready for free trade"; duties under reciprocity agreement of 1911; members elected to support reciprocity; President Harding and world peace; Washington disarmament conference; trade rivalry cause of war; population greatest need of Canada; five million Canadians in United States; immigration; Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply, 27. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 27; criticisms of Speech from Throne by Mr. Meighen; co-ordination of National railways, 28; government's immigration policy, 29; national resources of western provinces, 29; Near East Crisis, explanation of circumstances, 29-33; communications from British government, 30; delay in receiving despatches, 31-32

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions Com. report, 2181
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annuities branch, transfer, 1641
Australia, trade treaty, 245
Banff national park, power privileges, 3750
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4437, 4676
Bell, Major Graham A., salary, 4557
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M. P., 4
Board of Audit Act, 4249
Bolton speech, 2974
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Empire exhibition, 3950
British mails, delay in, 2639
Budget, 3046. Speech of leader of Opposition; attack on Liberal party; fidelity to pledges and principles; Liberal platform of 1919; presentation of "chart"; statement to convention after adoption of platform; resolution presented by opposition in 1921; appeal to the country; campaign speeches, 3047; position on tariff put plainly before people; Liberal platform carried out; the budget, charge that it is protectionist; tariff reductions; British preference; preference of 50 per cent and over, 3048; reciprocity, sugar duties, reduction; no increase in taxation; substantial tariff revision downwards; commercial treaties with France and Italy; Combines Act, 3049; free trade; speech of Mr. McMaster; theoretical study and concrete application; capital, attraction of; tariff walls going higher and higher; world conditions; free trade in Great Britain; slow progress of movement after its inception; industrial revolution; gradual elimination of tariff duties; reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and France, 3050; attitude of Progressive party and Mr. McMaster; leaders in British free trade movement; problems and difficulties in connection with the tariff; amendment, 3051; stability does not mean finality; United States tariff; European situation; British preference, increase of, 3052; cattle embargo, removal of; development of Canadian railways and ports; trade to Pacific ports by Panama canal; trade relations with the United States; Canada seeking new markets; tariff and economic warfare; declara-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tion of Genoa Conference; endorsement by Assembly of the League of Nations, 3054; economic conditions; statistics indicating revival; building operations; imports and exports; bank clearings; savings deposits; immigration; employment, 3055
Speech on, reference to, 3056, 3068
Statements omitted from, 2898
Business of the House, 179, 199, 250
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Early, 74
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven p.m., 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
Twelve midnight, 4672
Capital punishment bill, proceeding, 487, 1810
Economy of time, 382
Estimates, presentation, 4556, 4598, 4603
Facilitating of, 1836, 4736
Legislation pending, 2518, 3265
Announcement, 3452
M. that Com. rise to report progress, 1836
M. (Mr. Carroll) on oleomargarine, special order, 3270
Private members' day, 1158, 1160-62
Progress of, 2469
Prorogation, 4736
Facilitation of, 4732
Questions as orders for returns, 1385
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com., 1305
Select standing committee, personnel, 3, 202, 435, 486, 811, 1483, 2047
Sittings
Morning, 4132, 4249
Not later than midnight, 4579
Saturday, 2694, 3453, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1305
Concurrence, 4735
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. 4440
Campaign of 1921, speeches, 3047
Canada, constitutional development, 4474
Canada Temperance Act, correspondence, 1308
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, 3705

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Amalgamation, 34
Order in council tabled, 53
Branch lines construction bill, 4400
Rejection by Senate, 4754
Directors, board of
Additional director from Quebec, 34
Labour representation, 1652
Grand Trunk
Gratuities, royal commission, Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2347
Shareholders' representations, 3960
Grand Trunk Pacific debenture holders, 3507
Management, responsibility and powers, 3673, 3677
Paris offices, 3673
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3954, 3959
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4727
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4001
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Capital punishment bill, 487, 1810
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Cattle embargo removal, correspondence, 4133
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
China, trade relations with, 2313
Chinese immigration bill, 2312-33
Evasions, 2315
Exclusion, 2313
Head tax, 2312
International relations, 2312
Labour competition, 2312
Restriction of immigration, 2312
Students, 2313
Christie, Mr. Loring resignation, 3988
Civil Service
Bonus 1811
Commission, appointments, 371
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Political partisanship, 286
Superannuation, 4593
Work outside regular duties 1675
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 349, 358, 362, 374, 377, 522, 536, 545, 552, 559, 568
Special committee, 936
Appointment, 986
Change in membership, 2417
Coal, cost of, 1813
Combines bill, 254, 496, 938, 987, 2519, 2602, 2615-38, 2659-68, 2701

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Combines bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed, 2520
Civil Service Act, appointments, 2661
Commissioners, appointment and remuneration, 2627
Definition "combine" 2615, 2666
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar
Appointment, 2628
Inquiry, 2618
Senate amendments, 3505
Statement of provisions, 987, 2520
Technicalities, 2665
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605
Cost of living, reference to, 1812-13
Crowsnest pass agreement, extension, 2741. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs duties on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
M. (Mr. Motherwell) for discharge of order, 3449
Daylight saving, 2612
Debates, official report of
Pages said to be missing, 888, 889, 1082
Revised edition, enquiry, 122
Deceased members, tribute to, 4
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4557
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2384, 2386
Disarmament, Great Lakes, correspondence, 244, 494, 1307
Dominion Elections Act, amdt. 1027
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Election of 1921, speeches, 3047
Estimates, time of presentation, 4556, 4598,
Comparison with previous government, 4603
External Affairs, department, salaries, 3987
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Finance Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 4249
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1962
Suspension of, 1949
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark), 1285, 1490, 1962
Legislation to be introduced, 3265
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1284

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 336
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Grain shipping rates, information, 2517. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Royal commission to inquire into, 1211
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695, 3272
Grant, Dr., civil service, 560
Halibut fishery treaty, 4437, 4474, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Correspondence tabled, 1256
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Ratification by His Majesty, 1309
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1694
Hector celebration, 4706
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Hindu franchise, 4077, 4665
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 4442
House of Commons staff, organization, 4592
Housing, legislation, 2518
Hudson Bay railway, Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement, 1686
Immigration. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1330
Attitude of Conservative and Progressive parties, 1333
Forke, Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Reorganization, inquiry, 3324
Willison, Sir John, telegram, 1331
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Bill respecting (Mr. Neill) 4441
Exclusion, possible results, 1453
Japanese
Japanese stowaways on freighter, 1448
Lemieux agreement, 1447
Negotiations with Japanese govt. 2328, 4441
M. for return, 1261
Policy, 1330
Immigration Act Amdt. bills
Undesirable classes, 2669, 4441
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 3453, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4661
Forecast of discussion, 3453
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4665
Preferential tariff, 4661

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4440
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 2063, 4361
Illicit liquor traffic, 2208
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3978
Internal Economy commission, 3
International Labour Conference
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1647
Italian Treaty bill, 2437, 2701
Japan
Immigration from. *See under this title,* Immigration
Secret agreement, 1448
Trade with, 1449, 2313
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 5
King's birthday, observance of, 3323
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1669
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour
Estimates, 1643
Right to organize, 2895
Strikes correspondence, 816
Lack of confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 213 216, 226
Lafortune the late Mr. D. A. M.P., 4
Lake freight rates, commission, 247
Legislation arising out of report, 3507
Lake of the Woods
Control, 247
Control board expenses, 4001
Levels 247
Lausanne conference, 54
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Legislation, Senate salaries, 3949
Liberal convention of 1919, 2994, 3047
Labour resolution, 1652
Liberal platform, speech of June 1, 1920, 2994
Library of Parliament, 202
Joint committee, 516
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture by Chinese bandits, 2695
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
McDougall, Mrs. William, pension, 3949
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.,
Appointment to Bench, 1810
Retirement, 2392

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Militia and Defence disbursements, 344
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways and Canals
Appointment, 519, 1081
Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
Mines and minerals com. report, 4743
Montreal harbour commission bill, 3463
Moose Jaw by-election, 2295
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Near East crisis, 29-33
Correspondence, 45
Newspaper combines, 2524
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 1309, 2519
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3326, 3524
Precedence, 3451
Special order, 3270
Orders in council, government by, 1652, 1655
Orient, trade relations with, 2313
Pan-American union, 496
Paris agency, 4001
Parliamentary government, 1652
Passports, issuing of, 3988, 4708
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744
Pension board, resolution for removal, 3400
Pensions, old age
Legislation, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res. 1651
Mothers, and, conference with provinces, 3046
Petition of right, fiats, 3146
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1315, 1538
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 247
Prices, monopolies and, 2521
Printing Committee, 202
Private betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494
Private bills, consideration, 1836
Privilege, Mr. Carroll, 3270
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 417, 421
Single transferable vote, 1661, 2181
Public expenditure, 4556
Public Works
Estimates, 4557
Tenders, 4568
Publicity representative in London, 2984
Pulpwood, prohibition of export
Farmers and settlers, 4513
Royal commission, 4709
Purchasing commission, 3950, 4001
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Quebec, statutes of, 1660
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Redistribution bill, 250, 436
Special committee
Reference to, 488, 572
Report, 4742
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers unemployment relief, 1680
Returns, inquiry for, 3962
Roberts, J. H., imprisonment, 1660
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement on secession, 3145
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, hours, 4514
Rush-Bagot treaty negotiations, 2700
Russia, relations with, 3402
St. Lawrence river waterway, 204
United States, negotiations with, 3208, 4513
Saar valley commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Sales tax
Exemptions, 2998
Speech in 1921, 2997
Senate and House of Commons report, 2794
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4734
Senate, estimates, 2694
Sastri, Right Hon. Mr., letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Shipping combine, 4077
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207
Singapore naval base, 2470, 3822
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5
Stouffville, speech at, 1430
Supplementary estimates, presentation, 4558
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288, 1298
Toronto viaduct, 4441
Trade Mark and Designs Act Amdt. bill, 2063
Treaties
Newspaper reports, 245-6
Signing of, 4474
Triplets, bonus for, 3145
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., appointment to Bench, 1868
Unemployment relief
Conferences with provinces, 436
Expenditure, 1656
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1680
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
United States liquor laws, 4295
Vimy ridge memorial, 180
War
Commitments, 859
Glorification of, 2687
Wheat board
Extension of legislation, 2696, 2740
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

King's Birthday Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

King's Printer. *See* Printing Bureau

Kingston dry dock, 4563

Kitchener
Local improvement taxes, 1022
Manufacturers and United States markets, 2856

Kitsilano Reserve. *See* Indians

Klondike. *See* Yukon

Knitting Industry. *See* Textiles

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural conditions, special committee, 667
Canadian Air Force, 1750
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4319
Rejection by Senate, 4753
Fixed charges, qu. 814
Cheque tax, 3934
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4254
Drainage areas, 3259
Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4680, 4685
M. for consideration of Senate report, 1032, 1079
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Route, investigation by air service, 1750
Statement as to cost, correction, 2296
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Welland canal and, 3779
Indians, 2162
Duck lake school, 2159
Lake Grain rates bill, 4226
Melfort branch line railway, 4319
Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
National Defence, ammunition, 1741
National monument, Connaught place, 2686
Order paper, absence of, 4744
Paddockwood branch line railway, 4319
Paris agency, 4001
Penitentiaries, 770, 773
Port Nelson dredging, 1012
Public buildings, rents, 1025
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions, 776
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2028

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Steamship services, 4003, 4004
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Waterhen lakes drainage, qu. 4303
Welland canal construction, 3779

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Arrangement between Whips as to adjournment, 53
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317, 4319
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4574
Hudson Bay railway, 1062
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse claim, 4574, 4725
St. Peter's-Louisburg branch line, 4319
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Wrecks, removal of, 3332

Labarre, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3138

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Returned Soldiers
Advertisements, 287
Asiatic competition, 2485. *See also* Immigration
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4016, 4041
British Columbia, conditions in, 1125
British National Labour party
Capital levy, 2722
Policy, 2721
Building trades. *See also* Building
Drift to United States, 1129, 1812
Canadian National Railways. *See also that title*
Directors, representation of, 1652-6, 3636
Labour costs, 1561
Capital and, 2744, 4026. *See also* Capital and Labour
Canadian Pacific railway shopmen, 3338
Cheap, 1118
Chinese, 2310, 2316, 2330. *See also* Immigration
Civil Service. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Special committee, representation on, 937
Coal miners from Belgium, 1177
Combines bill, trades unions not affected, 2666
Competition, 1287, 1418, 2485
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conferences, 1443, 1678
Conventions, 1645, 1652
Copper bounty and, 3031
Cost of living. *See that title*
Costs, 1561, 2748, 2876

Labour—*Con.*
Delegates from United States, detention, *See* Howat
Demand for, 1248
Department
Actuaries, 1677
Annuities branch, 1672, 1682
Old age, administration, 1639
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Superintendent, 1677
Assistant deputy minister, 1671
Canada Gazette, printing, 1707
Capitalistic, 1674
Co-operation with provincial departments of labour, 1678
Deputy minister, 1675
Employees and cost, 2970
Estimates, 1621, 1668
Reduction in, 1638-43
Immigration and, 1170
Salaries and contingencies, 1657, 1668, 1694
Staff, dismissals and transfers, 1671, 2032
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Discontent, 1194
Dominion and provincial
Conference, 1442
Jurisdiction, 1442
Eight-hour day, 131, 207, qu. 279, 287, 1643
4,000. *See also under this title,* Hours
Jurisdiction, 1650
Moore, Mr. Tom., 1427
Emigration of. *See* Emigration to the United States
Employers and immigration, 1193, 1194
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Employment, 1124. *See also* Immigration and *under this title,* Unemployment
Index number, increase, 3055
Employment offices,
Co-ordination, 1643
Director of, 1672, 1676
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Provincial, 2169
St. John, 3453
Espionage, 1142-3
Factory and Shop Act, 1443
Farm, 37, 38, 1100, 1174,1416, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Agriculture; Immigration
Competition of protected industries, 2731
Wages, 1240, 1355
Winnipeg, in, 1976
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Opinion of Justice department, 1650
Financial Post, labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
Grand Trunk, employees' compensation, 1564

Labour—*Con.*
Hours, 1416, 1643, 1841. *See also under this title,* Eight-hour day
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4514
Station agents, 132
Howat, Alexander, detention. *See* Howat
Immigration. *See also that title.*
Attitude on, 332, 1167, 1177, 1186, 1193, 1197, 1224, 1241, 1337, 1413, 1426, 1892-3, 2816
Restriction of, 1104
Trades and Labour Council, and, 1419
"Unseen Hand," the, 1201
Imperial federation, 4651
Industrial disputes. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, 1141
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1655, 1702, 1716. *See also that title*
Federal jurisdiction, 1646
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Granting of boards under, 287
Limited application, 1702
Industrial and "closed" towns, 2886-91
International Association of Machinists, res. 1338
International Federation of Trade Unions, 3158
International labour bureau, 3994, 4000
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1642
Carnegie, Colonel, 1648
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1647
Incomplete return, 1539
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., 1539, 1647
Recommendations and conventions, 1643, 1645
Tabled, 1441, 1631
Report of 1922 meeting, 1442
Representation, papers tabled, 1483
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1648
Statistics, 1631
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Labour bureaus, 1424
Labour Gazette, 1621
Correspondents, 1626
Cost of living, 1684, 1812
Michell, Professor, figures, 1700
Cost prices and freight rates, 1958
Editor, 1625, 1671
Federal Printing Company, 1621
Hooper, Mr. Roland, 1625
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1708, qu. 3131
Union label on, 1621
Labour members, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033

Labour—*Con.*
Labour party platform, 2728, 2815
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Liberal platform "plank" 1652
Lord's Day Act, federal jurisdiction, 1646
Macdonald, Mr. Ramsay, labour vote in Great Britain, 2722
May Day, 3158
Mechanics, qu. 203
Skilled, emigration to United States, 2790
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention at border. *See* Meyerscough; Howat
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Moore, Mr. Tom
Delegate to International Labour Conference, 1642
Immigration, 1167
Labour representative on Canadian National Railway Board, 1654, 3636
National Industrial Conference, 2890
Organization of, 50, 123, 2815
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Organizing power of, 1857
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Chinese Immigration bill
Penitentiaries, 772
Pensions, old age, 1646
Popular attitude towards work, 1189
Powell River Paper Company, 2886
Printing bureau. *See also that title*
Estimates, 1710
Professional agitators, 2943
Public works, 950, 956
Railway companies acting as agents, 1191
Railways, 126, 132, 1426, 3621
Renovated butter, 4251
Representation in House, 3033, 3555
Requirements in northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Right to organize, 2886, 2890, 2896
Bank employees, 4084, 4161
British constitution, 2894
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Contract between workingman and employer, 2894, 2896
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2894
Legislation, necessity for, 2896
Treaty of Versailles, 2889
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duty, seven-day week, 4514
Espionage, 1142
Industrial disputes, 1141
Royal commission on industrial relations, 2889
Short hours and high wages, 1416

Labour—*Con.*
Shortage
Lumber camps, Financial Post, statement of, 1125
Saturday Night, statement as to, 1125
Skilled labour, 1224
Strikes, 84, 123-125, 1628, 1702. *See also under this title,* Industrial Disputes
Advocates of, deportation, 2434
Agricultural labourers, Great Britain, 2822
Cape Breton. *See under this sub-title,* Nova Scotia
Conciliation, 2786
District 18, coal miners, 1629
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Lewis, Mr. John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Nova Scotia coal miners, 495, 815, 866, 1627, 1716, 3155
Board of Conciliation award, 1628
Correspondence, 914
Troops, use of, 861, 893
Nova Scotia steel workers, 287, 397, 1643, 1703, 1705
Rainbow shingle mills, Chinese workmen, 2319
Shipping and railway, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) for papers, 245, 495, 815
Thetford Mines, 2207
Troops, employment of, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627, 2893, 3072
United States coal miners, 1262, 2786
Technical Education
Administration of act, 1637
Director of, 1674
Trade unions, 2786
Combines bill, not affected by, 2666
Congress at the Hague, 46
Troubles, 123, 2893. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Unemployment, 50, 628, 1125, 1168, 1187, 1194, 1242, 1348, 1657, 2819, 3032. *See also* Immigration; Soldiers
Calgary post office, 629
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3828, 3843
Decrease of, 15
United States in, 2650
Employment offices. *See under this title,* Employment Offices
Great Britain in, 1205
Hoboes, origin of, 1194
Insurance, 1638
International Labour Conference, 1646
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, letter, 2719
Municipalities, statements as to, 41-43
Order in council No. 220, 435

Labour—*Con.*
Unemployment—*Con.*
Pensioners, 2168
Provision for qu. 732, 1657
Purchasing power, limitation, 2716, 2725
Relief, 1644, 2730, 3032
Calgary, 1679
Expenditure, 1655, 2969
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Federal assistance withdrawn, 1655-58, 1678
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 689
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Responsibility for, 1657
Seamen, 3379
Value of time lost, 1685
Vancouver, 1340
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085
Winnipeg, 435, 1124, 1215, 1416, 1883
United Mine-Workers of America, 3155
Delegates, detention at border, 2297. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Unorganized workers, 3534
Unskilled, employment for, 80
Wages, 1240. *See also* Cost of Living
Average, 2720
Bricklayers, $12 per day, 3017
Building trades, 2165, 3004
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363
Inflation, 1167
Inquiry by fair wage officers, 2982
Loss through strikes, 1628
Manufacturing, 2876
Miners, 3206
Railway, 2800, 2876, 3190, 3205
Reduction, 2800
Textile industry, 3467
United States, 1165, 1248, 2650
Urban and rural, 35-36, 1240, 1355
Wage slavery, 2727
Wage system, 2723
War labour policy, 2887
Welland canal, 3762
Whitley councils, 1654
Workingman, position of, 2982

Labour Party, 2728, 2815

Labrador

Boundary, Mr. James White, salary, 4667
Discovery of placer gold, 1995
Report, 2611
Labrador Goldfields, Limited, qu. 2696

La Chambre de Commerce, Montreal, Bankruptcy Act, 1492

Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 208; neg. on div. 243-4

Lacroix, Mr. Eugene, postmaster, Sayabec. *See* Post Office

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4105-24
Bank loans and deposits, 1133
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1506
British Columbia fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1541
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1213, qu. 2611, 2419
Chinese immigration bill, exclusion, 2482
Civil Service patronage, 368
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4270
Emigration to United States, 1085
Exhibitions, 1467
Forest destruction by fungi and insects, qu. 2178, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1007
Freight rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1967
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 316
Illicit still cases, remissions, 2299
Immigration
Assisted class, 1100
British Columbia, co-operation with, 1096 1097
Empire settlement scheme, 1096
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098
Oriental, 506
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 506
Indians, potlatching, 2163
Interest rate, 4105, 4108
Labour department, co-operation with provinces, 1678
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 221
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 734
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2795
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2117, 2122
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3550
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-69
Disability attributable to war service Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3717, 3736
Royal commission, recommendations, 2983
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664

Ladner, Mr. L. J.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 390, 393, 398, 432
Renovated butter, 4270
Returned soldiers, death from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 921
Scientific knowledge, contributions to, 1286-7
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Titles, honours and decorations, M., 1285, 1297
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Unemployment, provision for, 1657
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 261, 332

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Imperial Conference, 4653

La Flèche, Colonel. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 4, 6, 8, 16
Letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281

Lake, Mr. R. S., Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Lake Freight Rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake Grain Rates Bill
Res. 3960, 4218; 1r., 4235; 2r., 4276; com., 4290; 3r., 4295
Sections and subjects discussed:
Canadian and American ports, 4218-4234
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 4223
Cargo space, 4219
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4219, 4222
Discussion, opportunity for, 4225
Insurance, brokers prohibited from writing, 4219, 4223
Interpretation, "board", 4291
Jurisdiction of parliament, 4227-31
Penalties, 4219
Rates, discrimination in, 4218, 4222
Power to fix minimum, 4218
Receiving and tabulating charges, 4294
Shipping combines, prosecution of, 4227
Tariff to be filed with Grain Commissioners 4219

Lake Grain Rates Commission. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake of the Woods. *See also* Water Powers
Control board
Expenses, 4001
M. for papers, 247

Lake of the Woods—*Con.*
Levels, 247, qu 2700
Water powers, 3421, 3425

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act 1921 Repeal Bill
1r., 2885-6; 2r., on div. 4163-80; com., 4181; 3r., 4185
Agreement with Ontario government, 2885

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 3354

Lamont Park, Buffalo reserve, 3941

Lanark, election, 157

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual training, 865
Imperial Conference, 4656
Imperialism, 4657
Indemnity of members, 4242
Labour Gazette, 1622
Military expenditure, 865
M. for reduction, 866
Naval service, 4657
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
War, Canada's participation in, 4656

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Natural Resources
Clearing by fire, 1185
Colonization of, 1178
Decrease in value, 2019
Dominion reversion of. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Homesteads, second. *See* Dominion Lands
Hudson Bay railway, sold for, qu. 283. *See also that title*
Patents, issue of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bill
Policy, 1344
Purchase price of, 1178
Railway, purchases or sales, 1739
Reclamation, 2969. *See also* Dominion Lands
Sales of. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization
Immigrants, to, 1431
Scrip frauds, 730
School lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Schools
Settlement, 43, 1893, 3060. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldier Settlement
National land settlement plan, 1182
Soldier settlement and, 2019. *See also that title*
Speculation in, 1119, 1395, 1887, 2955

Lands—*Con.*
Taxation, 1178, 1395. *See also that title*
Land values, 2745, 2778, 2803, 3016
Tax sales, 4062
Unimproved, 1118
Vacant, 1105, 1344

Landlord. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Language Questions. *See* French Language

Lanoraie wharf, 969

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Eastern Lands Company, 626
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 661
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Georgian bay elevators, qu. 620
Immigration policy, 1401
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Lumbering in Timiskaming district, 1402
New Ontario, agricultural conditions, 1401
Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307
St. Lawrence river waterway, 661

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Alaskan, wreck of, 1660, 3330
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084, 3365
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3820, 3974
Boots and shoes, free admission, 3500
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540, 1544, 1546
Salmon canning industry, licenses, 1544
Business of the House, adjournments to discuss, etc. 1540
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coastal regulations, suspension, 4276
Distressed seamen, 574, 3969, 4207
Masters and mates certificates, 2418, 2668, 3146, 3972
Pilotage, 3146
Registration of foreign ships, 3749, 3961, 3973
Canadian Arctic expedition, reports, 3360
Canadian National Railways, Mr. Talbot, 2004
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 538
Detroit river, regulation of traffic, 3358
Dredging, unification of work, 3341
False creek bridge, 3376

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Fisheries
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Publicity, 3364
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
White Mud river, fishway, 3363
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 4009, 4207
French Treaty bill, 2216, 2256, 2815
Bottles, 2218
Bronze powder, 2217
Butter, 2217
Cotton, 2218, 2263
Dairy products, 2217
Favoured nation, 2219
France
Balance of trade, 2221
Exports to, 2216
Friendly relations with, 2216
Line of attack, 2216
Luxuries, 2221
Sales tax, 2279
Silks, 2221, 2256
Treaty of 1907, 2222
Grain shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Halibut fishery treaty, 4132, 4440, 4459
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4461
Visit to Washington, 858
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Johnston, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231
McConica, Mr., congratulations upon return, 1660
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 3371
Marine and fisheries
Annual report, 1080
Committee, report, 3084
Distressed seamen, relief, 574, 3332, 3375, 3969, 4207
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Thunder bay, etc. 3359
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Hopper barge, construction, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Ice obstruction, Cabot strait, 2614
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, British Columbia, 1660
Stations, Long Point, Lake Erie, 3335
Lighthouse service
Lights, new, 3357
Maintenance and repairs, 3353

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lighthouse service—*Con.*
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Marine signal service, 3358
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Masters and mates, examination, 2610. *See also under this title,* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, 3354
Navigation
Aids to, 3357
Obstructions to, 3334
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage, 3146
Administration of, 3358
Pensions, 3359
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3335
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334
Wrecks
Investigation into, 3160, 3330
Removal of, 3332
Montreal harbour commissioners bill, 4508
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2640, 3508
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Political patronage, 3344
Quebec arsenal, 888
Radiotelegraphy
Broadcasting stations, 3374
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
Regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill 2086, 2284, 2467
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Alleged dismissals, 3344
Tariff
Liberal policy, 2221
Opposition resolution of 1922, 2220
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3399, 3963, 4207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1290
United States steamer Siloam, capture, 2207
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 255-70, 332
Vimy ridge monument, 182
Visit to Washington, 734, 857

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 657
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Lard. *See* Meat Products

Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border. *See* Immigration; Labour

Larkin, Mr. P. C. *See* High Commissioner

Larouche, Que., postmaster, qu. 3137

Laurentians, The, 4312

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Administration, 2815
Canadian railways and ports, traffic for, 175ℓ
Conscription issue, 3015
Election of 1896, 2936
Hudson Bay railway, 1053, 1061, Announcement ,1047
Immigration policy, 1177, 1425
Imperial Conference, 4663
Last public address, 2995
On hour of meeting in 1918, 1
McMaster, M., and, 3030
Monument, 1017
Protective system, 2719
Reciprocity, defeat of, 3015
Tariff reduction and Senate reform, 2908

Lausanne Conference, 54

Lavaltrie, Que. wharf, 969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Bank draft tax, 3929
Canadian National Railways, directors, 4525
Immigration dept. employees, Quebec, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Little, Mr. W. R., qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Transfers, qu. 2517, qu. 3141
Indemnity of members, 4240
Little, George, deportation of, qu. 3704
Orleans island bridge, 3646
Quebec, Champlain station, 4446
St. Charles river improvements, 4447
St. Malo repair shops, 4447
Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Talbot, Mr. O., 4525
Toronto viaduct, 4446

Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020

Lawyers, charges and standard of living, 1154, 2813. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Lead Pencils, marking of goods, 2988

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herds, 584, 2131, 2132
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2131, 2137
Assiniboine river
Damage by flood, 993, 3041
Expenditure on dyking, etc. qu. 3264
Budget, 3039. Reception of budget in West; district board, Portage la Prairie, resolution; betrayal of the people; British preference; direct importation; obligation to Great Britain for removal of cattle embargo; free admission of British goods; cheque tax charged by grain buyers to farmers, 3039; cattle trade; freight rates, ocean rates; Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels; statements of Mr. Motherwell and Mr. Grisdale, 3040; Assiniboine river floods; resolution of Elie branch of United Farmers; Canadian National Railways, traffic and management; annoyances and inconveniences to passengers; railway equipment; people patronizing their own road; cattle shipment over Canadian Pacific; Riley's army, transportation Ottawa to Toronto, 3042; government interference with railway management; government plea for economy not sincere; new officers with high salaries; Mr. Duncan Marshall; Hon. Mr. Pugsley; members' indemnities, reduction of; extravagance in administration; cabinet ministers absent from duty; cabinet ministers, number in Canada and United States; speech of Mr. McMaster on budget; Manitoba Free Press, stand in defence of common people, 3043
Cattle, ocean space, 2123, 3040
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Experimental farms, 461-486
M. to reduce neg. 486
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 943
Health of animals, 583
Hudson Bay railway, 461
International fishing boat race, 114
Live stock
Ocean shipping rates, 2133, 3040
Removal of cattle embargo, 3039

Leader, Mr. Harry—*Con.*
Ministers' salaries and members' indemnities, 3043, 4243
M. for reduction of, 1153
Reference to, 2915
Officials attending fairs, qu. 285
Portage la Prairie
Representation of, 2680
Sewerage outlet, 993, 997, 2680
Railway mail service, cost of, qu. 3143
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Deductions for non-attendance, 4243
Tuberculosis in cattle, 583

League of Nations. *See also* Imperial Conference
Activities and policies, 3993
Assembly
Tariff
Economic warfare, 3054
Stability, 3053
Canada's contribution to Permanent Secretariat, 3990
Canada's participation in foreign wars, 4000
Canada's withdrawal from, 3999
Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture in Ottawa, 1685
Criticism of, 3993
Expenses of Canadian delegation to, 3989
Franco-German relations, 4652
International Labour Conference, 1441, 1652
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
M. (Mr. Power) for withdrawal, 1529
Saar Valley Commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Silesia, partition of, 3995
West Ukrainian republic, settlement, 651

Leases
Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Coal lands. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Leather, free admission to United States, 3016

Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Leblanc, Mr. Louis, qu. 285

Le Droit d'auteur. *See* Copyright Act Amdt.

Lee, Miss Barbara. *See* Immigration department

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
English and French, harmony between, 1341
Export Act Amdt. bill (pulpwood) 4347, 4354
Kent Northern railway, 4190
Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Léger, Mr. A. T.—*Con.*
Lighthouses and lightkeepers
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347, 4354

Legislation. *See also* Government; House of Commons; Senate
Class, 2851
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
House of Commons, 2691
Committees, expenses of, 4674
Indemnity of members, 4674
In advance of public sentiment, 2925
Joint Committee on, 4008
Paternal, 727, 1133. *See also* Race Track Betting
Preparation and form of, 4007
Provincial, disallowance of. *See* Disallowance; Jurisdiction
Record of, 407, 408
Retroactive, 3128
Senate, salaries and contingencies, 3949
Too much, 2543, 2547, 3434. *See also* Combines bill
Uplift, 2054

Legislative Council. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Leitch, Professor
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Dairying industry, 1843

Leitche's Creek, N.S. wharf, 943

Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement. *See* Immigration; Japan

Lemont, Mr. Arthur. *See* Immigration, Agents

Leprosy, treatment of. *See* Health

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. 3870, agreed to, 3871
Petroleum, crude, bounty, 3914, 3922

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Level Crossings. *See* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Raiways; Toronto

Levels, National. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lévis
Dry dock, 1261
Postmasters, qu. 519
Quarantine station, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 117. Expenditure on agriculture; criticisms from Maritime province members, 118; condition of western farmers; immigration policy, 119; competition in wheat markets, 120; economy in length of session, 120; Near East crisis, 120-121; sales and stamp taxes, 121; necessity for economy in public expenditures. 121
Agricultural conditions in western provinces, 119, 1841
Agriculture
Department, salaries, 611
Immigration and, 1228
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4096-4116
Bounty system, 3922
Cadet services, 881
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3626, 4201, 4333
Dunblane-Mawer, 4201, 4333
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Paris offices, 3626
Cheque tax, 3933
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 543
Civil Service examinations, 366
Combines bill, 2599
Registrar, powers of investigation, 2626
Cost of living, combines and, 2599
Customs drawback, hatters' sweats, 3502
Domestic servants, provision on trains, 1477
Dredging, 1012, 3340
Eggs, price of, 1841
Expenditure in excess of revenue, 1230
Free trade, necessities of life, 1230
French treaty, agricultural implements, 2247
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 2105
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration
Alleged discrimination in favour of West, 1098
Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Child, 1227, 1470
Experience as an immigrant, 1226
Great Britain from, 1105
Literature, 1226
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
Policy, 1225
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2436

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J.—*Con.*
Indians, 2149
Interest rate, 4116
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 839
Matapedia bridge, 1014
Members' indemnity, 4009
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
National gallery, 1018
Naval service, 910
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3536
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849
Pension commissioners, board of, 3743
Petroleum bounty, 3922
Prices, spread in, 1230
Provincial educational rights, 1884
Public works, surveys and inspections, 1020
Quebec arsenal, 884
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3478
Royal Canadian navy, 910
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3778
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, abolition of, 1230
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
Soldier settlement, 2021, 2027
Sorel shipyard, 3349
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar duty, 3479
Swift current public building, 1023
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trade commissioners, 1841
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3777
Western provinces, conditions in, 1225
Wines, tax on, 3938
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334

Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815

Liberal Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2414
Charge of abandonment of policy, unfair, 3010
Conventions of 1893 and 1919, 2777. *See also under this title* Liberal Platform
Senate, elective or nominative, 1369
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2971
Disappointment with, 2812

Liberal Party—*Con.*
Election promises in 1896 and 1921, 2951
High protectionists in, 2931
Influences preventing carrying out of pledges, 2909
Liberal platform of 1919, 2603, 2777, 2885, 2932, 2952, 2974, 2991, 3007, 4393
British preference, increase in, 454
"Chart" 3047
Circumstances of adoption, 3019
Economy, 2003
Endorsed by opposition in 1920, 2994
Euler, Mr., statement of, 3019
Failure to implement, 2981, 3066
French treaty, 2211
Government should not be asked to carry out, 2852
Immigration, Chinese, 1652
Interpretation of, 3047
Labour legislation, 1651, 1652
Maclean, Hon. Mr. (Halifax), statement of, 3019
Planks from, included in amendment, 2861
Progressive party, opposition to, 2925
Proportional representation, 407
Quotation from, 3019
Repudiation of, alleged, 2994, 3019, 3047,
Resolutions moved in opposition, 2736, 3047
Tariff, 1222, 2714, 2718, 2736, 2737, 2872, 2904, 2957, 3008
Planks not carried out, 2220, 3062, 3033. *See also under this title,* Tariff
Taxation, 2003
Luxuries, 2011
Liberals and Conservatives, Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142
Liberals, responsibility for expenditure, 2921
Pledges and promises, 2908, 2981, 2992. *See also under this title,* Conventions; Liberal Platform
Elections of 1896 and 1921, 2908, 2981, 2992
Repudiation of, alleged, 2793, 3035
Senate elective or nominative, 1369
Tariff
Difference between Liberal and Conservative, 3008
Platform of 1896, 2908
Policy, 3007
Protective, 2818
Record since 1896 3009
Stability, new doctrine, 3064

Liberal and Conservative Parties
Alleged union on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142

Liberalism, "watchwords of the past", 3014

Libraries. *See* Public Libraries

Library of Parliament
Committee, 53, 202, 516
Change in membership, 615
Estimates, 2691
Salaries, contingencies, etc. 2692

Life Imprisonment. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Life Saving. *See* Canadian National Safety League; Marine

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers. *See* Marine

Lignite. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Lincoln, Abraham, on immigration, 1236

Lindsay
Arsenal 883, 1744, 1752
Market scales, 208

Linen
Linen thread. *See also* Textiles; Treaties, French Treaty
Bounty, 2647
Linen yarns, 3897
French treaty, 1981
Industry, 3897

Liquor. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Customs and Excise
Beer, excise taxes, qu. 518
Bonded liquor warehouses. *See under this title.* British Columbia; New Brunswick
Bootlegging, 2410, 2419, 3358. *See also* Belle River Harbour
Brandy. *See also* Treaties, French
Duty on, 2742, 2999
French, 444, 2643, 3478
Breweries and export liquor houses
Licensing, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, qu. 1866
British Columbia, 2405-11
Purchases by British Columbia government, 2410
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, qu. 1974, 2404-7, 3144
Canadian and Scotch whisky, competition of French brandy, 3478
Canadian National Railways, transportation, 1868, 3324
Drunkenness, convictions for, 2411
Exportation, 2404, 3144, 3704, 4295
British Columbia, qu. 1260
Government control. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Illicit stills
Prosecutions, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Remissions of fines, 2299

Liquor—*Con.*
Illicit traffic, Canada to United States, 2208
Importation
For sale under regulations, 2404, 3704
Provinces, into. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Intoxicating, consumption of, qu. 285
Laws, evasion of, 2543
Manufacture, 2410, 3704
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
United States laws, 4295
Wines, 3035. *See also* **Treaties, French**
Beer and, excise taxes, qu. 518
Duty, 2710, 2999
Abolition of, 2742
Reduction of, 2643
Excise tax, qu. 518, 2656, 3937, 4425
French treaty, 438, 442, 452, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225
Native, prohibition of, 2411
Port, manufactured at False Creek, Vancouver, 2411
Yukon, 86

L'Islet wharf, 969

Literature. *See also* Advertising; Immigration
National. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Recognition of work in. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Lithographic Works, marking of goods, 2988

Little Current, Ont., harbour, 982

Live Stock. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Live Stock Acts Amdt.
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, *and under this title,* Health of Animals
Alberta, 1435
Animal contagious diseases. *See also that title*
Eradication board, 2699
Research, 2867
Canada's position as a live stock country, 2934
Cattle
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Diseases *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Embargo. *See also* Agriculture, Experimental Farms
Removal of, 15, 25, 26, 38, 48, 148, 170, 575, 1869, 2871, 3053

Live Stock—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Embargo—*Con.*
Removal of—*Con.*
Conference, 3989
Correspondence, 4132, 4184, 4295
Credit for, 3293
Doherty, Mr. Manning, 3293
Drury, Hon. E. C., 3293
Effect of, 1101
Health of Canadian herds, 2132
Inquiry, 575, 576
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3293
Pledge of British government, 3531
Shipment to Great Britain. *See under this sub-title,* **Shipment to Great Britain**
Stock, classification of, 3291
Export to United States, 1410, 2910, 3293. *See also* United States
Feeding
Shipment in car lots, 595
Winter feeding, 469
Markets, 2871
Ocean freight rates on, 2127, 2136, 2757, 2807, 3040
Prices, 300, 2877
Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, 2871
Weight and, 2871
Quarantined at Levis, qu. 3141
Reciprocity, 3082. *See also that title*
Scrub, 2810
Shipment to Great Britain, 208, 1036, 2807, 3017, 3324, 3641. *See also under this sub-title.* Embargo
Alleged unsanitary condition of boats, 2127, 2613
Finished cattle shipped as stockers, 2872
First, 3309, 3310
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, reported statement, 3041
Dundee at, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3811
Grisdale, Dr., statement, 3040
Rates, 2133, 2963
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Trial shipment, expenses, 4675
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Vessel space, 1868, 1869, 2757, 2963 3040
Testing, 1307, 2133
Trade, development of, 3040
Chicago Fat Stock show, 1398
Community breeding, 476
Condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Contagious diseases. *See under this title,* Health of Animals

Live Stock—*Con.*
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307
Destruction by timber wolves, 597
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Estimates, 575, 587, 4675
Experimental farms, 457, 460-85
Export. *See under this title,,* Cattle, Embargo, Shipment;*and also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Feeding. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Health of Animals, 483, 575, 4676. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Accredited herds, qu. 206, 484, qu. 492, 577, 626, 3064, 3302
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim, 582
Compensation for slaughter, 462-486, 576, 582
Hall, O., and McDougall, W. F., veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hog cholera, 582
Contracted from whey, 3299
Pathological laboratories, 578
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579, 2866, 2868
Tuberculosis, 576, 2469
Buffalo, 3439
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Eradication, 3989
Restricted area, Manitoba, 576
Tuberculin test, qu. 1972, 3065
No encouragement to farmer, 2933, 3300
Hogs
Bacon type, 2864
Breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865
Corn-fed, 2865
Garbage feeding, 582
Grading, 466, 590, 1905
Prices, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Horses
Glanders, serum for, 579, 584
Horse-breeding, 588
Market for, 590
Racing of. *See* Race Track Betting
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207, 2253
Thoroughbred, breeding of. *See* Race Track Betting
Tariff on. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports and exports, supervision of. *See* Live Stocks Act Amdt
Improvement, 2773
Indian reserves, 2159, 2162
Infected, sale of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Live Stock—*Con.*
Loans, 4103
Loss from inferior, 2862, 2866, 2867
Markets, 588, 594, 1410
Prices and quality, 2862. *See also under this title,* Cattle
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See also that title*
Cattle embargo, 3293
Reported statements, 2614, 3041
Trip to South America, qu. 1031
Poultry. *See that title*
Prices, 2862, 2877. *See also* Prices *and under this title,* Cattle
Decrease in, 1410
West, in, 1101
Propaganda, 594
Purchase of thoroughbred stock, by Mr. E. S. Archibald, 3290
Ranching, 588
Sheep, 2866
Pure-bred, importation, qu. 3141
Screenings, feeding on, 2040, 2867
Sheep-raising. *See* Textiles; Woollen Industry, M. (Mr. Drummond)
Shipments, inspection of, 3334. *See also under this title,* Cattle, Shipment
Stockyards
Agents at Prince Albert and Moose Jaw, qu. 1156
Fraudulent practices, 276, 485, 576
Moose Jaw, qu. 1156, 2779
Prince Albert, qu. 1156, 2779
Union, 2762
Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587
Trade. *See also that title*
South America, 594, qu. 1031
Visit of Canadian commissioners to, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Transportation. *See also* Freight Rates
Hudson Bay railway, 1071
Tuberculin test. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Western Canada Live Stock Union, 2699
World competition, 2781

Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Marketing, consolidation and amendment)
1r., 193; 2r., 276-277; ref, to Agriculture Com., 277; report of com. 1441; com., 2200; 2992; 3r., 2293; Senate amdts. 3150

Live Stock Exchanges. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill

Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745

Lloyd George, Right Hon. David
Agricultural conditions in Great Britain, 2755
Career of, 1399
Free trade and protection, 3012
German reparations. *See* Germany
Great Britain, unemployment, 1205
Liberalism, "fair play for the under dog," 3014
Near East question, 4655
Proportional representation, 392
Socialist strength in Great Britain, 2722
Turkey, threatened war with, 2815

Loans, 93, 630, 2642. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Harbours, advances to
Agricultural 1400. *See also* Credits
Borrowings of former government, 2831
Comparative commissions on, 158-9
Conversion, recent, qu, 386
Farm. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits
Interest, 2831
Live stock, 4103
New York, 1922, 154-155, 630, 640, 2963
Provincial, 2987
Roumanian and Greek, qu. 623, 2010
Vocational. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
War, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804

Lobster Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Local Improvements. *See* Public Works

Lockeport, N.S. wharf, 943

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079
Bienfait briquetting plant, 2512
British preference, direct importation, 3455
Coal, duty, 3498
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4671
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Johnston, Mr. Alex., Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 4671
Members' indemnity, 4009
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3878
Amdt. time for appeal, 3881, agreed to, 3881

London, publicity agent, reported appointment of Mr. W. T. Cranfield, 2927, 2983, 4707

London Times, comment on Canadian immigration, 1111

Lord Selkirk Association, monument to Indian Chief, Peguis, 4704

Lord's Day Act, discrimination against poor, 3585

Lougheed, Sir James
Hudson Bay railway, 1033
Labour members of parliament, 3033

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Annual training, 95th regiment, 863
Arthur Young and Company, qu. 1137
Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration, qu. 1633
Budget, 2944. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2944; budget generally acceptable; return of prosperity; tariff, downward revision; revenue requirements; postage rates, reduction; fishing industry handicaps and difficulties, 2945; reduced freight rates; United States markets; machinery for manufacture of fish waste into fertilizer; optimism of Maritime provinces; immigration; pessimistic utterances of Progressives; Mr. Forke on the budget; statement of Mr. H. W. Wood, 2946; amendment; agriculture, assistance of; forest conservation, 2947; pulpwood, restriction of export; work of Mr. F. J. D. Barnjum in interest of forest conservation; cheque tax; bounties, free admission of machinery; sugar duty; sales tax; British preference; reciprocity, 2948
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, 535
Cost of 1917-22, qu. 1137
Clementsport postmaster, 1796
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4351
Forest conservation, 2947, 4351
Foster, Mr. A. deWitt, qu. 1633
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1137
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4571
Military hospitals, medical staff, 677
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3855
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 2948, 4351

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2138
Budget, 2871. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Canadian cattle embargo, removal of; value of British and United States markets; prices, Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, Scotland; weight and price; finished cattle shipped as stockers; unlimited quantity of cattle available for shipment; agricultural conditions; protection unfair to West; double standard of selling

Lovie, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and buying; Premier Dunning on the tariff; Liberal tariff planks; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; revenue tariff and protection; excise duty, 2872; taxes paid to protected manufacturers; agricultural conditions in Western Canada; statement of Mr. Samuel Larcombe at Winnipeg; wheat, market for; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; unprofitable crop of 1922, 2873; hard wheat; mixed farming; letter from Mr. J. Scott; farmers who own automobiles; automobiles in Ottawa, 2874; mill feeds, adulteration of; freight rates; lumber, price of, 2875; freight, classification of; transfer charges; express rates; labour costs in industrial and agricultural occupations; cost of living, 2876; protective tariff; disparity between producer's and consumer's prices; cheque tax, limitation; discrimination in favour of rich; protection, 2877; Hudson Bay railway; British preference; world conditions; cancellation of war debt, 2878; Sir George Lawson Johnston on payment by Great Britain of debt to United States; dollar reserve fund in Canada, 2879
Experimental farms, 477
Farms of 160 acres, 1087
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4546
Health of animals, 580
Horse-breeding, 588
Mill feeds, adulteration of, 600, 2875
Seed inspection, 196

Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695, 2795

Lower, Mr. A. R. M., fisheries of Hudson bay, 1065

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply, 74, 75. Unfair criticism of Progressive party, 75; Great Britain our best market; condition of western farmers, 76; immigration policy of government, 77; revision of Bank Act; transportation of grain; comparative grain rates; economy in administration, 78; the government and its platform; old party divisions, 79
Agricultural loans, 1400
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4041
Bruederheim branch railway, 4199, 4316
Canadian air force, 1749, 2418
Central repair shops, 1750

Lucas, Mr. W. T.—*Con.*
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4198, 4316
Canadian Pacific Railway, qu. 625
Land, 3704
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Disallowance, Nova Scotia statute, 2378
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1011
Elevators, dockage, 2044
Finance Act 1914 Amdt bill, 4408
Freight rates, reduction of, 1400
Grain pooling, 1400
Immigration
Banks and, 4042
Canada Colonization Association, 1399
Chinese, 1445
Policy, 1397
Institutions, surplus of, 1400
Lloyd George, Right Hon. David, 1399
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261
Public Works engineering branch, 1017
Railway mail service, 1790
Raisins and dried currants, 3478
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Tariff reduction, 1400
Western provinces, conditions in, 1398

Lumber. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Alleged labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
British Columbia in, 1245
Combine, 2593
Competition and prices, 2593
Creosoting industry, qu. 813, qu. 1137, 1245, 3234
Vancouver Creosoting Company. 3231
Depression, 3002
Freight rates, 139, 1961, 2855, 2875, 3036
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Importation for Welland canal, qu. 1867
Manufactures of, 1989. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Prices, 2875, 3036
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Railway ties, freight rates and prices, 3036
Sales tax, 4181, 4418
Sawdust pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Temiskaming district, 1402
Timber exportation, 3416
Wood-working industry, 2806

Lumbermen, emigration to United States, 1125.

Lunenburg, N.S. harbour, dredging, 4576
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580

Luse Land Company. *See* Immigration

Lusitania. *See* Germany, Reparations

Luxuries. *See also* Taxation; Treaties, French Treaty
Demand for, 1856

Macallum, Dr., discoveries in helium, 4439

Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpœna, 4145. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill, Merchants Bank

Macbrien, General. *See* National Defence

Maccan Coal District. *See* Coal

Macdonald, Hon. E. M. (Acting Minister of National Defence)
Acting Minister of National Defence, appointment, 2295
After war conditions, 1231
Annual drill, 4635
Bank Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Chair ruling of, 4720
Motions, anticipatory, 3329
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3961
Rejection by Senate. 4698
Coal
Freight rates on, 1277
Purchase of in United States, 3493
Management, responsibility and powers, 3690
Paris offices, 3616-17, 3689
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3617
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition, 1937
Class consciousness 1233
Coal
Canadian National Railways, 1277, 3493
Duty 3493
Nova Scotia 1277
Combines bill enforcement of 4229
Criminal Code amdt. (Betting information) 4733
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute 2372

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Dredging Maritime provinces 4591. *See also under this title* Harbours and Rivers
Emigration to the United States 1234
Eskimos, trial of, 4674
Experimental farms, buildings, 4630
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
Freight rates
Coal, 1277
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1937
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1937
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1277
Halifax grain elevator 4714
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 4586
Nova Scotia, 4561, 4563
Dartmouth, 4568
Digby, 4568
Dredging, 4569, 4591
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Little Anse, 4722
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4572, 4722
Lunenburg, dredging, 4576, 4577
Ship Harbour, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Ontario, 4589, 4594
Belle River, 4596
Port Maitland, 4589
Prince Edward Island, 4586
Georgetown, 4587
Quebec, 4588
Rimouski, Raymond and Talbot, Messrs. claim, 4588
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3597
Hector celebration, grant, 4636, 4705
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 510
Homestead lands in the West, 1087, 1090
Hudson Bay railway, discontinuance, 1062
Immigration
Empire settlement board, 1237
Hebridean, treatment of, 3597
Maritime provinces, and, 1236
Oriental, 509
Policy, 1230-38
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 509
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3452
Justice, administration of, 4674
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4229
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2052, 3582, 3975

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 1738
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2121
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, desertions, 2418
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Estimates, 4635
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976. *See also under this title,* Petawawa
National spirit, 1232
Naval service, recruiting, 2897
Northover, Major H. R., claims, 4635
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3552
Discussion of, 3329
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Policy, 3451
Parliament buildings, common meeting room, 1727
Party system, 1235
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 3749
Public buildings
New, 4615
New Brunswick, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4613, 4628
Ontario, 4615
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, architects, 4633
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public Works
Estimates, 4561, 4594
Roads and bridges, 4590
Reciprocity, defeat of, 1233
Redistribution
Intention of government, 4250
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee, 857, 937
Reports
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4736
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Sworn as member of Privy Council without portfolio, 1764
Toronto
Customs building, 4624
Harbour improvements, 4610
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Seed branch building, 4622
United States civil war, conditions following, 1232

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.
Confederation and, 1366

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.—*Con.*
National policy, 2838
Reciprocity, 2922
Senate and House of Lords, 1374
Title, 1295

Macdonell, Rev. Father
Immigration
Hebridean, 3585
Scotland, from, 1876

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
British Columbia telegraph lines, 1017
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4314
Chinese immigration bill, 2322
Conditions in British Columbia, 2322
Merchants, Vernon, telegram, 2322
Officer in China, 2322
Codling moth, 597
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 1014
Experimental farms, 464
Fruits and vegetables, registration, 2307
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Hope-Princeton highway, 2342
Immigration
British Columbia, into, 1095
Canada Colonization Association, 1346
European, 1346
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Oriental, 509, 1346, 2322
Policy, 1345
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 509
Indians, British Columbia, Major McGraw, 2163
Kamloops-Okanagan line, 4314
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837
Mara, B. C., postmaster, qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Military hospitals, 671
Okanagan lake wharves, 1008
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3723
Seed testing bill, 2307
Sugar lake telegraph line, 1017
Summerland experimental farm, 464
Western provinces, conditions, 1347

Mackenzie River District
Half-breed claims, 3409, 3444
Steamship services, 2176

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 47

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Annual drill, 4637
Artificial limbs for disabled soldiers, 675
Boy Scouts, 879

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
British preference, direct importation, 1772, 2948
Budget, 2948. British preference, increase of direct importation, 2948; French and Italian treaties, limitation to Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, comparison of mileage and traffic; Canadian grain passing through United States seaports; petroleum bounties and tariff on oil; proposal to curtail and discontinue; immigration policy; Maritime provinces ignored; lecture of Mr. F. W. Kerr in Isle of Man, 2949; Hebridean immigrants; naval recruiting in the interior; forest conservation; government economy, 2950; civil government; Hudson Bay raiway, 2951
Cadet services, 879
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3970
Canadian air force, 1748
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Negotiation for sale of 27 ships, 1975
Steamship sailings, qu. 4511
For 1924, qu. 4751
Canadian National Railways, 2944
Atlantic division, 1770
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Chicago traffic originating at, 1769
Comparison, mileage and traffic, 2949
Directors, New Brunswick representative, qu. 282
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal. 1768, 1769
Halifax terminals, qu. 4510. qu. 4751
Policy, discussion of, 1762, 1764
Regulations, 496
St. John station, 4310
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1009
Emigration to United States, 1198
Employers' liability compensation, 695
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Flour shipments, Canadian and United States ports, 1767
Forest protection, 2950
M. (Mr. Michaud) 822
French treaty, direct importation, 2303, 2949
Grain shipments, 1767
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 948
Hector celebration, 4637
Hudson Bay railway, 2951, 4681, 4684
Immigration
Bowder, Mr., agent in Great Britain, 1198
Distribution of, 1198
Farm labourers and domestic servants, 1200
Hebridean, 2950
Maritime provinces ignored, 2949
Officers in Great Britain, 1879
Policy, 1197, 2949
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty, direct importation, 2401, 2948
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as minister, 1764
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2116, 2119
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021, 2685, 2688
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4706
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854-67, 4747
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3711
Petroleum bounty, 3919
Post Office department, printing, 1818, 1820
Public ownership, railways, 1770
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Questions unanswered, 4455
St. John
Employment office, 3453
Harbour improvements, 2677
Immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, 1021
Terminals, 4445
St. John and Quebec railway extension, 4310
Sales tax, 4427
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, 3822
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4427
Taxation, payment in postage stamps, 1821
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Vancouver harbour bill, 261
Venereal diseases, 705
Vocational loans, 687

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4083
Budget, 2967. Congratulations to Finance Minister; debt and interest charges; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2967; budget the best possible under circumstances; tariff revision; tendency downwards; reciprocity, offer to negotiate; attitude of United States; British preference, increase in; sugar duty; expenditure and economy, 2968; irrigation, water power survey and land reclamation; immigration; unemployment relief, 2969; migration of Can-

MacLean, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
adians; air force; Civil Service, number of employees; Civil Service Commission; government departments, increase in cost of, 2970; Canadian National Railways; improved situation on eastern division; courtesy of officials; Crowsnest pass agreement, claim that concession forced by Progressives, 2971; natural resources of western provinces and Maritime provinces; agricultural conditions in Prince Edward Island; fishing industry; reciprocity; distribution, cost of; middleman; producer and consumer; confidence and co-operation; evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; cost of living, 2972; tariff stability; deficit; reduction of; reasons for supporting budget; amendment, 2973
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3436
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 557
Combines bill, 2601
English and French, harmony, 1341
Forest protection, 3419
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Maritime provinces, summer resorts, 3436
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Natural resources, 2972, 3436
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3730
Proportional representation, 432
Public expenditure, east and west, 3436
School lands, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed potatoes, inspection, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035, 4080-4124, 4133-60, 4509
Merchants' bank, 4037, 4050, 4156
Proceedings before Banking and Commerce Com. 3887
Shareholders' audit, 4090
Bank mergers, 4138
Merchants' bank 4037, 4050, 4156
Banking and Commerce Committee
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Printing of proceedings, 3887
Reports
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Committee—*Con.*
Reports—*Con.*
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Budget, 3000. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3000; speech of Mr. Meighen; budget, form of presentation; budget statements in Great Britain; budget well received in country; expenditure and taxation, burden upon taxpayers, 3001; the future bright; agriculture; fishing industry; business and industrial depression; problems should be faced in national spirit; Canada difficult country to govern, 3002; secession, talk of; accentuation of provincial and local problems; group political organizations; Alberta farmers resolution; European reconstruction; European origin of Canadian commercial conditions, 3003; wheat prices; emigration to United States; government not responsible; economic causes of movement; inflation in the United States; building trade, 3004; balanced budget; public expenditure; attitude of public and parliament; Hudson Bay railway; commission to inquire and investigate, 3005; commercial feasibility of route; Welland canal; railway extension in the West; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, deficit; deficit in financial operations of government; railway deficit and taxation, 3006; tariff policy of government; Liberal platform of 1919; too much importance attached to; statesmen who have reversed opinions on public policy; Sir Robert Peel and repeal of Corn Laws, 3007; tariff declarations of Liberal Convention; unwise to re-write tariff schedule; Progressive platform; inconsistency of Conservative party; consistently protectionist; Conservative arguments in favour of protection; position of Liberal party, 3008; tariff board; tariff reduction; free trade; Progressive party, inconsistency of; Alberta coal, transportation to Ontario; record of Liberal party since 1896; preferential tariff, 3009; reciprocity agreement with United States; opposition to reciprocity by Progressive members; recent tariff reductions; free trade and revenue; amendment;

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
taxation; income tax; reliance upon customs tariff; tariff, unwise to abandon; United States, attitude towards Canada; Fordney tariff, 3010; reciprocity offer; tariff stability, 3011; problems to be solved, 3012
Speech on, reference to, 3070
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Committee on, 2474
Competition with subsidized service, 3381, 3385
Deficit, 3006
Canadian National Railways, 3006
Committee, 2474
Management, responsibility and power, 3695
Paris offices, 3694
Cheque tax, 3934
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 272, 273
Commercial union, 3907
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4214-17
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 631
Distressed seamen, 3973
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Freight rates, control of, 4226
French treaty, 444
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Hudson Bay railway commission to inquire, 3005
Insulin, supply of, 704
Interest rate, 4105
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 232
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4224-28, 4292
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3997
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003, 3019
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3318
Merchants' bank merger. *See under this title,* Bank mergers
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3274
Nova Scotia miners' strike, troops, 898
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Reciprocity with United States, 3010, 3907
Steamship services, West Indies, 3379
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 258, 259, 262

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4135-45, 4147
Banks
Charters, limitation of time, 4147
Combinations of, 2578
Mergers, 4135
Notes, substitution for national notes, 4408

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4440
Budget, 3055. Mr. McMaster in "Greenland"; doubtful virtue of consistency; speech of Prime Minister; professed protectionist; grievances of East and West; railway question; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific; public vs. private ownership; effort to acquire or destroy national system, 3056; strategic advantages; present deficits but success assured; waterways complementary to railway system; company-owned railways; railway situation in United States, 3057; traffic pools and running rights; personnel of management; capitalization; stock exchange gambling; necessities of life; grain and sugar speculation, 3058; race-track betting; new Franchise Act needed; equality of citizenship as between men and women; previous discussion in parliament; right to revise constitution, 3059; tariff; immigration and land settlement; grievances of Maritime and western provinces; banking legislation; rural credits; war clouds 3060
Canada, constitutional development, 4473
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3842
Canadian National Railways, 1050, 3056
Annual statement of minister, 1617
Branch lines construction bill, 4193, 4335
Courtesy, 2971
Electrification, 3203
Estimates, 1566
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1667
Public ownership, 1618, 3056
Report, 3223
Securities, approval of, bill, 4403
Toronto approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Unification of system, 3195, 3223
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2575
Parliament, right to investigate, 2666
Combines, steamship, 2667
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4209-15
Constitution
Right of Canada to make her own, 1378
Right to revise, 3059
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3327
Farm loans, 1088, 3060, 4366
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4407
Forest protection, M. Mr. (Michaud) 824

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Amdt. 3223
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1965
Grain, 1965
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1965
Reclassification, 1618
Waterways, 1619
Fuel supply, 3198
M. (Mr. Church) 1272
Government printing, 1733
Halibut fishery treaty, 4473
Hebridean immigrants, 2950
Highways, effect on railways, 1619
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3222
House of Commons acoustics, member should occupy central position, 1721
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374, 1378
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1049
Hydro Electric Commission, 2682
Imperial Conference, 3223
King's birthday, observance, 3323
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4219
Merchants bank, 2576
Mining companies shares, 4209
National Defence estimates, 859
National land bank, 4366
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2185
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Parliament buildings, 1725
Peat experiments, 3199
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3851, 3860
Petition of right, fiats, 3146, 3222
Proportional representation, 420
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Public ownership, 3842
Railways, 3056, 4194
Railways, co-operation between, 4337
Redistribution bill
Opportunity for discussion, 488
Representation by population, 572
Rural credits, 1088, 3060, 4366
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Sales tax, imports, 4409
Senate, elective or nominative, 1373, 1378
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, qu. 3820
Sugar trust, 2576, 3058
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Viaduct, 4447
United States Federal reserve bank, 4407
United States, preferential treatment, 440

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
War commitments, 859
Water powers
Export of electrical energy, 1272
Survey of, 3203
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummand) 933

Macneil Case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Macphail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Agricultural conditions, 1190, 1844
Agriculture, expenditure, 3241
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4048
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Experimental farms, 3241
Farm women, 1844
Immigration
Domestic servants, 1189
Farmers and farm labourers, 1190
Policy, 1189
Labour, attitude towards mental and physical work, 1189
Life on the farm, 1189
Members of parliament, party funds and, 4237
References to, 1243, 1249
Rural depopulation, 1189, 1844
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-47
M. to refer back, neg. 4247
Sessional allowance, M. to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242
Soldier settlement, 2022, 2026
Questionnaire, 1845
Trade
Encouragement, qu. 284
Representatives, qu. 284

Macphail, Sir Andrew, immigration, 1393

McAdoo Award, 126

McArthur, J. D. & Co., Hudson Bay railway claim, 4686, 4689

McArthur, Mr. J. J., international boundaries, 3246

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Annual training, 872
Army officers, settlement in Canada, 1432
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4065, 4096
Mutual insurance companies, 4037
British Columbia
Agricultural production, 1432
Liquor law, administration, 2427

McBride, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
Brule lake-Grande Prairie projected railway, 4699
Budget, 3031; pessimism; playing politics; sales tax; pyramiding; equalization of the tax; copper bounty; hemp bounty, 3031; proposed extension; employment of Canadians; British preference, clothing; old age pensions; unemployment relief; highway construction; immigration bill, statement by Sir James Lougheed and Senator Fowler, 3032; labour members, reflection on; people from British Isles, 3033
Building materials, prices, 2165
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2412-15, 2427
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3825
Disposal of, 3385
Grain trade, 4234
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4315
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canoe wharf, 1005
Cariboo wharves, 1005
Chinese immigration bill, 2309-27
Coal
Freight rates, Mines and Minerals Com. 4514
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202
Conscription of fire fighters, 3409
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Easter adjournment, 1162
Exhibitions, 1467
Experimental farms, 475
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4352
False Creek bridge, 3376
Fishways, 3363
Forest protection, 3409
Fruit industry
Alleged combine, 2616
British Columbia, in, 147
Fuel supply, 3202
Grazing inspectors, appointments, 3254
Harbours and rivers, British Columbia, 1005
Hemp bounty bill, 3913, 4388
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4641, 4648
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202
Immigration
Chinese, 2309-27
Estimates, 1446

McBride, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Chinese—*Con.*
Exclusion of, 2327
Schools, 2326
South Africa, 2327
Hindu 1128
Franchise, 4641, 4648
Literature, 1433
Oriental, 511
Policy, 1432
Imperial Conference, 4641, 4648-60
Indians, 2152
Kamloops-Okanagan railway, 4315
Kamloops public building, 1006
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4234
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2199
Navigation schools, 3331
Oleomargarine, Agriculture Com. discussion, 3267
Ore-testing plants, 2507
Peace river district
Immigration, 1433
Railway construction, 1433, 4698
Peat, comparative value of, 3202
Penitentiaries, 771
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Prince George-Peace River railway, 1434, 4701
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4352
Railway rates
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1926
Grades, etc. qu. 625
Renovated butter, 4263
Rural depopulation, 1432
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1789
Salmon Arm wharf, 1006
Settlers' relief, 3447
Steamship services, 2171
Taxation, building materials, prices and, 2165
Telegraph lines, revenue, 3946
Trent valley canal, qu. 4301
Western provinces, conditions, 1252
Winter trips to California, 1252

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Address in reply, 166. The late Mr. Stewart; condition of the West, 166; wheat prices; amendments of Messrs. Hoey and Shaw 167; economy everywhere necessary, 168
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4201
Paris offices, 3700

McConica, Mr. T. H.—*Con.*
Congratulations upon return to House, 1660
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3531
Wheat Board, correspondence, 626

McCraney, Mr. George E., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Haileybury public building, 4615
Unemployment, 1125

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 378
Government workkshops Ottawa, 4620
Private Bills Committee
Reports
First, 936
Fourth, 2204
Fifth, 2417
Sixth, 2837
Seventh, 3323
Eighth, 3887
Tenth, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

McInnes, Mr., resources of Hudson bay region, 1072

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317
Half Island cove, 4572
Sonora wharf, 4585
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4317

McKenna, Mr. J. A. J., Hudson bay route, 1063

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria; Solicitor General)
Appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Canada Temperence Act, 574, 767
Correspondence with British Columbia, 1032
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Fuel supply, 800
M. (Mr. Church) 1273, 1283
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382
Nova Scotia coal, 800, 1273
Reported statement in Halifax, 147
Resignation, 1763, 2392

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Budget, 2981. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff on sugar and clothing; Liberal pre-election promises; tariff changes not very encouraging; by-election results; handwriting on the wall; duty on exports and imports of beans, 2981; production of beans in Canada; competition with Austria and Japan; Japanese wages for labourers; prices of beans to consumer; conditions of workingmen; fair wage officer; satisfied labour a bulwark against Bolshevism; country needs strong national policy 2982

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Civil Service
Appointments, 1922, 3324
Returned soldiers, 386
Grain dockage, qu. 4300

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McLean, Kennedy and Company, ocean rates, 2127

McLennan, Professor
Helium 703
Scientific discoveries, 1287

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Acoustics, "bedside" manner of speaking, 2446
Address in reply, 172. The amendments; view of Minister of Finance, 172; amendments sanctioned by best modern constitutional practice, 173; necessity for a downward revision of tariff, 174
Agricultural conditions, 1858
Special committee on
Leave to report, 911
Reports
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136, 1209
Fourth, 2127
Fifth, sixth and seventh, 4007, 4075
M. to concur in, 4295, 4363
Tariff Commission evidence, 2296
Agriculture, economic organization, 1858
Alpine Club grant, 3954
Attitude towards tariff policy, 3055
Audibility of debate, 3327
British Empire exhibition, 3949
Budget, 3012. Speech of leader of Opposition; reference to Mr. Sinclair; Great Britain and debt reduction; free trade; Mr. Lloyd George, statement by; 3002; United States tariff; reciprocity; permanency of arrangement;

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
treaty of 1854; trade relations and national spirit; defeat of reciprocity agreement of 1911; proposed remedy for unsatisfactory economic conditions —protection and high taxes; Liberal party, attitude towards tariff; a mere "attitude of mind" not sufficient, 3013; to vote for amendment of Mr. Forke and against budget; to sit on cross benches; justification of action; Liberal principles; "need of retrenchment and reform"; "free trade, peace, good will amongst the nations"; "trust in the people"; Mr. Lloyd George's definition, "fair play for the under dog;" absurdities of protectionist principles; language of Liberal statesmen; election of 1896; Liberal budget of 1897; British preference and reciprocity; advances to Washington; reciprocity campaign of 1911, 3014; flag-flapping; racial cries and appeals to sentiment; "No truck or trade with the Yankees"; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; conscription issue; protectionist budget with strong Maritime flavour; amendment, 3015; claims for protection; reciprocity clause; revenue, methods of raising; tax on unearned increment of land; reciprocity negotiations; standing offers on Canadian and United States statute books; questions of permanence, 3016; United States offer of reciprocity in boots, leather and agricultural implements; ups and downs of the budget; raisins and dried currants, duty; artificial silk duty; hemp and copper bounties, 3017; protection governing principle of budget; not much difference between Liberals and Conservatives on tariff; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; protection a dismal failure; National Policy, anti-national and anti-social; Edmund Burke on function of parliament, 3018; repudiation of Liberal platform of 1919; attitude of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) and Mr. Euler; framing of tariff plank; the platform quoted, 3019; claim of Minister of Finance that he is not bound by platform; acceptance of nomination for leadership; amendments moved by Mr. Fielding in 1920 and 1921, 3020; budget repudiation of utterances of Finance Minister integrity of public life and maintenance of parliamentary institutions; reasons for undertaking an "unpleasant task"; relationship between member and constituent; Edmund Burke, 3201; not leaving party but refusing to support budget, 3022
Speech, comment on, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 4393
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4306
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Combines bill, 2581, 2660-69
Application for investigation restricted, 2617
Civil Service appointments, 2662
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Copper bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances to be repayable, 4369
Cross benches, 3014
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3366
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2349
Experimental farms, 471
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4333
Free trade, 3002
Agriculture and, 1858
French treaty bill, 454
Favoured nation, 2210
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 340
Grain inquiry, royal commission, 1209, 1212
Hemp bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances repayable, 4376
Immigration, undesirable classes, 2669
Liberal platform of 1919, 3019, 4393
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 853
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1212
Maple products industry, 1810
Marriage with deceased husband's brother, bill, 1256, 1836
Moose Jaw election, point of order, 1714
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2453
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3533
Parliament buildings, 1718
Commons galleries, members, 1729
Patents of Invention bill, 2069-78, 2083, 2097
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
New or amended patents, 2082
Points of order
Members coaching each other, 405
Moose Jaw election, 1714
Relevancy, 2663

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 403, 430
Protection, combines and, 2581
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4393
Purchasing commission, 3951
Purchasing power, depreciation in Europe, 1859
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 728
Res. in 1919, free food and implements, vote on, 2996
Rural depopulation, 1860
Shipping combine, 2583
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 3012
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget
Commission, evidence, 2296
Duties, pyramiding, 2998
High, revolt against, 1859
Policy, attitude on, 3067, 3013
Proposals, vote against, 3022, 3081
Trent canal, Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Binder twine, 4376
Educational opportunities, foreigners and, 1885
Government printing, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Hemp bounty bill, 4376
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3587
Policy, 1880
Immigration Act Amdt bill, 2429
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4277
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4168
Municipal and provincial extravagance, 1890
Natural resources, 1880-1
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2463
Judges, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2463
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 404
Railway problems, 1880
Shipping combines, 4277
Soldier settlers, fire insurance, 496
Taxation, burden of, 1880
Unemployment in Winnipeg, 435
Unrest, alleged, in western provinces, 4514
Winnipeg coal purchases, 496

McNeill, Paul. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1453
Appeals from convictions bill, 4250
Bamfield public building, 1024
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1505, 1525

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Bribery charge, Revelstoke and Nelson electors, 2941
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1553
Liquor legislation. *See under this title,* Liquor
Orientals and fishing industry, 1899
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-17, 2428. *See also under this title,* Liquor
Amdt., 2415, neg. 2428
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Chinese immigration bill, 2308-22
Merchants, amdt., 2320
Trade, 2320
Civil Service
Appointments, 372-3
Number in, 3264
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 370
Coast Range Steel Company, 2508
Downie, Mr. Donald, 777
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
Fraser river improvements, 1003
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 316
Health department, returned soldiers, 2171
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1324
Oriental, 1307, 1893
Child, 1453
Chinese, 1446, 2308-22
Assimilation of, 2321
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Labourers, 2310
Merchants, admission of, 1445, 2320
Regulations, evasion, 1445
Statistics, 1445
Students, 2319
Treaty with, 1448
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1261
Exclusion, demand for, 503
Hindu, franchise, 508
Japanese
Alleged rights as British subjects, 1899
Correspondence with Consul-General, 1894
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
Fishermen, 1899
Lemieux agreement, 1447, 1894
Petition against further immigration and naturalization, 2837, 2885, 4075

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con*
Stowaways on freighter, 859, 1448
Naturalization, 1453, 1899
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 503
Japanese trade, 1453
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 211
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia law
Administration, 2412, 2428
Bootlegging, 2414
New Westminster, sale of liquor, 2415
Ottawa Citizen editorial, 2412
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1974
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Correspondence with Vancouver county court judges, 2199
Japanese, 1899
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2183, 2199, 2465
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Orientals. *See also under this title,* Immigration, Oriental
Business competition, 1902
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Pacific highway, 2341
Parliament buildings, members' rooms
Allocation, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Pensioners, unemployed, relief, 2169
Petroleum bounties, 781
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, employment, 733
Returned soldiers
Health department, 2171
Unemployment, 2169
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, legal adviser, 777
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 925
Salmon fisheries, British Columbia, 1553
Secret agreement, 1448
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, qu. 3137

McRae, General. *See* Canada Colonization Association

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Agricultural conditions in West, 1352
Dominion lands, alienation of, 1353
Homestead pre-emption and purchase, qu. 1030, 1032, 4202

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H.—*Con.*
Immigration policy, 1352
Livestock agents, qu. 1156
School lands, 1032
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4204

Machinery. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Customs Tariff Items; Prices
For manufacture of fertilizers. *See* Customs Tariff Items
French treaty, 1981, 1988

Magazines and Periodicals. *See also* Press
Canadian
Competition, 1418
Encouragement of, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Postage, 4436, 4528
Sales tax, 4415, 4421

Magdalen Islands
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Pointe à Elie wharf, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) wharf, 977
Steamship service, 2174

Magna Charta. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Magrath, Mr. C. A., Fuel supply, 799

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Catalogue Prices. *See* Bancroft; Prices

Mail Subsidies. *See* Steamship Services

Main Estimates. *See* Estimates

Maine, state of, railway construction, 2902

Majority Government. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Majority Rule. *See* Proportional Representation

Malbaie, Que. wharf, 968

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British preference, cotton goods, 3466
Civil Service Act, special committee
Order of reference, 1256
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4592-3
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 762
Redistribution bill, 572
Textile industry, 3466

Malcolm Island, Finnish settlement, 1247

Malone, late Lieut. Col. W. P., qu. 206

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manila Fibre. *See also* Bounties; Hemp
Bounties, 4369
Rope, oil used for, drawback, 3502

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Adjournment, time of, 2694
Agriculture, votes for, 3237
Automobile insurance, 3148
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Budget, 2746. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of Mr. Raymond; conditions serious; emigration to the United States; causes; high taxation; railway deficits; small and scattered population; sectional interests and problems; depression, causes of, 2747; prices of manufactured articles and agricultural products; Europe, chaotic condition of; production costs; France, occupation of the Ruhr; world conditions; United States tariff against Canadian products; grain, exports of; home market; lower production; grain, exports of; home market; lower production costs; interprovincial trade; immigration, 2748; European immigrants, assimilation of; taxation, reduction of; Great Britain, retrenchment and tax reduction; sugar duties; national debt; stumping machines, lowering of duties on, 2749; boots for cripples; sales tax; contracts affected; too much pessimism; wheat export; gold output; coal deposits; silver production; cobalt; nickel; asbestos; water powers; pulp, paper and forest products; fertile lands; fisheries; iron ore; vigorous and virile people; causes for optimism; agricultural conditions; farm mortgages; farm credits; United States and protection; claim that United States is a free trade country; high duties imposed by United States; industrial development of United States, 2751; free trade, advocacy of in western Canada; protection and war; trade competition between Great Britain and Germany; Great Britain and protection, 2752; tariff as it affects East and West; world opinion favourable to protection; free raw materials, 2753; agricultural implements; tariff, periodical revision; advisory tariff commission; tariff revenue in Great Britain; taxation on necessaries of life; free trade and unemployment; poverty and pauperism in Great Britain, 2754; British agriculture under free trade; Lloyd George, statement of; Liberal tariff policy; National Policy tariff; stability; amdt. of Mr. Forke, 2755
Building materials, prices, 2164
Canadian Air Force
Camp Borden, 1775
Hospital, 1775
Forestry protection, 1776
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Long Lake branch, 4310
Paris offices, 3631
Cattle embargo, removal of, 3293
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions, 330
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction qu. 278
"Lady who rides to work in automobile", 1772
Returned soldiers, 1792
Cloud Bay wharf, 982
Combines bill, 2542
Copper bounty bill, 3237
Copyright Act Amdt bill, 2287, 3154
Song writers, 2287
Divorce proceedings, publicity, 2054
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 2034
Elevators. *See under this title,* Grain
Emigration to United States, 1113
Empire Settlement scheme, 288
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 3413, 4347
France, occupation of the Ruhr, 2748
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 329
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Leases qu. 4132
Screenings, 2039
Inquiry by Grain Commission, 2254
Sale of, qu. 1633
Unscalped or uncleaned, qu. 1739
Grain commission, 2036, 2254
Grain shipments, 3769, 3789
Injustices to western farmers, 1114
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar), 295
Port Colborne, qu. 1209
Shipments, 3769, 3789
Great Britain, to qu. 1867
Health department, salaries, 2170
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3597
Icebreaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 1105
Northern Ontario, 1097, 1112
Policy, 1110-1115

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Western Canada, conditions in, 1112
Indians
Agent, Mr. J. Garry Burke, 2151
Education, 2164
Northern Ontario, 2151
Preservation of, 2151-2
Tuberculosis, 2152
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3148
Labour
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1702
Strikes, 1702
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Legislation
Estimates, 2691
Too much, 2543
"Uplift," 2054
Lighthouses, date of closing, 3356
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 840
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 2116
Home-brew, conviction, 2121
National Defence
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1772
Expenditure, 3238
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 896
Orders in council passed, 1921-1922, qu. 1488
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3853-86
Amdt, 3886, agreed to, 3886
Pensions
European War and active militia, 2166, 3707, 3713
Pension Act, suggested amendment, 2166
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 3742
Royal commission
Findings, action, 2639, 3400
Interim report, 2166
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Pilotage, administration of, 3358
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Progressive members and protection, 3237
Proportional representation, 431
Public Works, salaries, 2684
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413, 4347
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3474
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744, 3892
Returned soldiers in civil service, 1772
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3769
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Soldier settlement, 2020, 2027, 2028
Tariff
Advisory tariff commission 2754
Agricultural implements, 2750, 2754
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1293

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Trade
Commissioners, 1837
Manufactured goods, exports, 1839
Trade and Commerce, estimates, 2031
United States tariff, 1113, 1119, 2751
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Wages, building trades, 2165
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3769

Manitoba. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural and economic conditions, 1213, 1220, 1404, 1462, 1906, 2766
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Bracken, Premier, statement on immigration, 1123
Canada Colonization Association, 1877
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal supply, 1265
Court of Appeal
Grain Inquiry Commission, decision, 1210
Trueman, Mr. W. N., K.C., appointment, 1868
Dairying industry, production in 1921, 2744
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2060
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 459
Freight rates, 1931, 1932
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Grand Jury system abolition of, 2695, 3272
Harbours and rivers, 993, 4589
Hemp production, 2780
Highways, 3184. *See* Canada Highways bill; Highways
Illicit stills, prosecution for operating, 3280
Income tax, 2859
Indians, 2145, 2153
Institutions and services in excess of present needs, 1214, 1400, 1890
Lake of the Woods bill, 2885
McLeod, Hon. G. L., help for needy farmers, 1404
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Mixed farming, 2772, 2773
Natural resources. *See also* Lake of the woods Regulation bill
Cost of administration, 2782
Political patronage, 3348
Prohibition referendum, 2414
Public buildings, 4628
Radio-telegraph service, 2285, 2468, 3338
Reclamation of land, 1065
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1156

Manitoba—*Con.*
Taxation
Agricultural products, 1404
Production and, 1391
Tax sales 2961
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Telephone system, 2285
Unemployment relief, discontinuance, 1658
United Farmers of Manitoba, 1404, 1462
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation bill
Wheat board, 2836

Manitoba Free Press, Sir Clifford Sifton and, 3043

Manna. *See* Dairying Industry

Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney-General, British Columbia
Asiatic immigration 1901
Liquor legislation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Manton, Judge, immigration, 1234, 1237

Manufactured Goods. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Industries; Textiles
Binder twine discrimination against, 2964
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Prices 1167, 2748. *See also* Prices
Spread between producer and consumer, 2713

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers Association
Difficulties, 2854
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Farmers and, 2716
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Japan, competition from, 2861
Licensed, 4410. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Markets, lack of, 2856
Not able to compete, 3062
Ontario and Quebec, 2910
Orient competition from, 2861
Profit, 2854
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue
Securities of manufacturing companies, 2720
Understanding between and people of East, 3023
United States
Competition from, 2861
Markets, 2856

Maple Products industry, 1810

Maps. *See* Interior, Surveys

Mara, B.C., post office, qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Marchand, Mr. J. O. *See* Parliament Buildings, Architects

Marcil Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Business of the House
Debates, official report, returns, 940
Private members' day 1160
Questions right to put on orders of day, 734
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4186, 4307
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 542, 553
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
Gaspe and Bonaventure forest fires, 4010
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4186, 4307
Grondines wharf, 967
Hudson Bay railway, 1041
Japanese immigration, Lemieux agreement, 1448
La Societie des Artisans Canadians Francais, 1028
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 843
National gallery 1018
Oleomargarine M. (Mr. Carroll) 3535
Petition of right, fiats, 3223
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 742
Rulings as Chairman
Amdt. not relevant, 3667
Debates, official report, statements not read, 1830
General argument on particular clause, 4069
Governor General acknowledgment of address, 1256
Member may not reflect on vote of committee 4119
M. that committee rise not debatable, 1836
M. to postpone resolution in supply, 3667
Newspaper article reflecting on proceedings, 4126
Reference to com. in advance of report, 2970
Reflection on sincerity and integrity of members, 4067
Rule 17B, closure, 3667
Supply, relevancy, 808, 871, 1847, 1858, 1861, 4336
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
Special delivery letter postage, 1872
Toronto viaduct, 4307

Marcouiller, Mr. C., St. Barnabé Nord postmaster, 1830

Margaree River Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Margaretville, N.S. harbour, 4581
Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Acts Amdt; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763 3160, 3330
Annual report presented, 1080
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Biological board, 3371
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Expenditure by provinces, statement, 3888
Johnston, Mr. Alex, deputy minister, 3373, 3671, 4667
Publicity, 3364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dredging
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Unification of work, 3341
Examination of masters and mates, 2610
False Creek bridge, 3375
Halibut Fishery treaty. See Treaties
Hopper barge, self-propelling, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Icebreakers, 3160
Ice obstruction in Cabot strait, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Murray Stewart, 3354, 3359
Thunder bay, etc., 3359
Inspection
Boats over 100 tons register, 1660
Live stock shipments, 3334
Steamboats, 3360
Institutions assisting sailors, 701
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, 3171
British Columbia, 1659
Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Rewards, 3335
Lights and lightkeepers
Boudrot, Mr. E., Green island, qu. 2613
Classification, 3352
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Descheneaux, Mr. Patrick, dismissal, qu. 4512
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lights and lightkeepers—*Con.*
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Reliance, wreck of, qu. 812
Richibucto cape, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Marine signal service, 3358
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, purchase, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354, 3359
Navigation
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Closing of, date, 3356
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3357
Obstructions, Seymour Narrows, 3333
Safeguards, lake Superior, qu. 812
Schools, 3331
Wireless telegraphy, 1046
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3375
Investigation into wrecks, 3160
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330
Maintenance and repairs to steamers, 3160
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Administration, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Pilot boats, 3358
Eureka, qu. 1364
Father Point, 3358
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3339
Dredging and maintenance, 3375
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trout-fishing season, 1686
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3356
Wrecking plants 3334
Wrecks, Alaskan. *See under this title,* Alaskan

Marine Hospitals. *See* Health; Marine and Fisheries

Maritime Provinces. *See also* New Brunswick; Nova Scotia; Prince Edward Island
Bank centralization, 4079
Boards of trade, conference with Sir Henry Thornton, 1755, 1771

Maritime Provinces—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, 1764, 1770. *See also that title*
Coal. *See that title*
Conditions in, 1207, 2763, 2936
Dredging 1009, 4590
Freight rates, 1963, 3192. *See also that title*
Coal from, 1272, 1813
Grievances, 3056
Immigration, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236. *See also that title*
Natural markets, loss at confederation, 2852
Natural resources, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Public buildings, 1022, 4614
Secession talk 1757, 2940. *See also* Secession
Roberts, Hon. W. F. reported statement, 3145
Senate elective or nominative, 1376
Shale deposits, 2513

Markets. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Industries; Live Stock; Manufacturers; Prices; Reciprocity Trade; Treaties
Access to, 2937
Agricultural products, 2731, 2861, 2910
Great Britain, 2869. *See also that title*
United States 2869. *See also that title*
Bacon, 2864
Beans, 2982
Cattle, 2871
Competition for, 2725
Dairy products, 2863
Development of, 2869
Disorganized, 2861
Export, 2869
Fish, 2906, 2946, 3002
Foreign, 4054
Fruit, 463
Hogs, 2864
Home, 2869
Industries and, 2975
Horses, 590
Live stock 588. *See also that title*
South America, 594
Manufactured products, 2910
Maritime provinces, 2852
Marketing and quality, 2862, 3066, 4027
Production exceeding demand, 2957
Purchasing power, 637
United States. *See also that title*
Fish, 2946
Wheat, 3068. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Marketing of Grain. *See* Grain

Markham, Violet. *See* Carruthers, Mrs. James

Marking Act. *See* Customs and Excise; Imports

Marking of Woollen Goods. *See* Wool

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4121
Budget, 3022. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of leader of Opposition, able but lacking in generosity; Sir Henry Drayton, amendment; position of Progressive party; difficult country to govern; understanding between manufacturers and people of West; agricultural and business conditions, 3023; difficulties universal; lower freight rates; loss of purchasing power, inflation; rural credits; demand for lower tariffs; free trade "a splendid theory"; revenue; not a protectionist but a development tariff; without moderate tariff industries would close, 3024; prices, Canada and United States; revenue and tariff, 3025; income tax; tax on unearned incomes; inheritance tax; excise duties, 3026; natural resources, development of; capital and people necessary; taxation direct and indirect; expenditure and economy; civil government costing too much; ratio of employees to population, 3027; deficit; spend only what we have to spend; tariff stability; tariff committee; permanent advisory tariff commission, 3028; production costs; distribution; spread between manufacturer and consumer; speech of Mr. McMaster, "chasing a rainbow"; free trade impossible, 3029; rejection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's tariff policy; result of government defeat; Wheat board a protective measure, 3030
Cabot strait, ice obstruction, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3836
Canadian National Railways, debenture holders, 3507
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Canadian Pacific Railway dividends, 1203
Civil Service Commission, 1800
Combines bill, 2536, 2615-21
Definition "combine" 2615
Registrar, inquiry, 2619
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3464
Emigration to the United States, 1128, 1392

Marler, Mr. Herbert—*Con.*
English and French speaking people, 1341
Firebrick, duty, 3482
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1948
Railway rates equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1947
Girl Guides, grant, 3954
Government publications, waste, 1713
Hospital supplies, coverings, duties, 3501
Immigration, 1391
Attitude of the West, 1129
Restrictions upon, 1128
Income tax, 3026
Proposed amendment, 4503
Unearned income, 2882, 3026
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4500
Labour, employment for all willing to work, 1124
McMaster, Mr., speech on budget, 3026, 3029
Montreal, postal appointments, 1800
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-82
Amdt. 3881, neg. 3882
Pension Commissioners, duties, 685
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1128
Taxation, increase of, 1121
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954
X-Ray plates, coverings, duties, 3501

Marriage
Publication of evidence, 1971
Settlements. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriage with deceased husband's brother, Bill respecting, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Married Woman, rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriott, Professor, England since Waterloo, 1231

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 70, 286, qu. 384
Agricultural instruction grant, 608, 3293
Appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture, 2615, 2710, 3043, 3150, 3303, 3320
Order in council, 3294, 3320, 3303
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Cattle embargo, removal of, 2614, 2871, 3041, 3293
Fordney tariff, 3293
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Qualifications, 3306
Redistribution, 3313
Reports, 3705
Salary, 608, 3043, 3287, 3309, 3352

Marshall—*Con.*
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, 3595
South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309, 3316
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Great Britain, 3290, 3308, 4675
Florida, 3307, 3311
South America, qu. 1031

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Address in reply, 101. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 101-102; deceased members; the Maritime provinces and representation, 102; government ownership of railways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; development of Canadian ports, 103; Minister of Justice, 104; Hants county; Mr. Shaw and Progressives; Near East crisis, 105
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Alaskan, wreck of, 3164
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3099, 3126, 3220
Bay of Fundy, icebreaker, 2615
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
British Columbia
Fisheries Commission, 3372
Fishing licenses, 1548, 1554
British common law, 2894
Budget, 2904. Liberal tariff platform, 2904; tariff for revenue; railway deficit and direct taxation; public ownership and low tariff; relations with United States; reciprocity; printing industry and United States market, 2905; Fordney tariff; markets; fish, 2906; reciprocity agreement of 1911; negotiations with President of the United States; the weapon in our hands; Treaty of 1818; use of Canadian ports by United States fishing vessels; license system, 2906; trans-shipment of catch; shipment in bond; suggested denial of privilege; bounties preferable to tariff increase; reasons for supporting budget; revenue requirements; revision downward; British preferance; elected to support Liberal party, 2907
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2694, 3452
Business profits tax, 4490
Calder Act, 2926
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3818

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4333
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3291
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3189
Civil service
Commission, ministers and, 371
Technical and professional officials, 815
Civil Service Act, M (Mr. Power) 525, 545, 546
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal, duty, 3499
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 273, 2056, 2086
Incorporated companies, 2058
Private enterprises, 2059
Constituents, interests of, 3550
Dairy industry, protection, 3552
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2350
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1010
English and French, harmony, 1341
Exchequer Court judgeship, 2500
Experimental farms, 461
Fertilizers, nitrate of soda, 2307
Fishways, 3363
Fort Edward, N.S., historic site, 3406, 3432, 3435
Fruit trees, new varieties, 2307
Fruits
Pre-cooling, 2056
Vegetables and, freight rates, 626
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs, detention, 3157
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Hydrographic survey, 3337
Immigration
Assisted, 1178
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Chinese, 1445
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3587, 3589
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4646
Japanese, Lemieux agreement, 1447
Imperial Conference, 4645
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4360, 4362
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Johnston, Mr. Alex., salary, 4667
Labour, representation in House, 3555
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 226
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4282, 4290
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Litle Anse, Morrison claim, 4723

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Narcotic Drugs Amdt. bill, 2118, 2122
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2185
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4619
Nova Scotia
Historical society, 3406
Secession talk, 2057, 2177
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3554
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4707
Patents of Invention bill, 2072
Pensions
Appeal board, 683
Old age and mothers, conference, 3046
Pension board, removal, res. 3399
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128, 3223, 3224
Playgrounds, children, 3407, 3432
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4679
Privilege—Civil Service Com. report, 4363
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Railway rates, reductions, 118
Representation, irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, 4490
St. John—Windsor steamship service, 2176
Sawdust pollution of rivers, 3364
Schofield, Rev. Dr., 3399
Seed distribution, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306
Steamship services, Maritime provinces, 2177
Tariff items carried without discussion, 3492
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1298, 4645
Toronto seed branch building, 4623
Windsor-Chester branch line railway, 4333
Windsor, dredging, 1010

Martello Tower, St. John, 3444

Marvale, wreck of, 3333

Massey Harris Company. *See also* Agricultural implements
President of and free trade, 2911
Settlement of war claims, 2497

Masters and Mates. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Matane, Que. wharf, 970

Matapedia Bridge, qu. 4184

Maxwell, Mr. C. F., Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2901

May, Mr. *See* Immigration, Agents

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Dryden, Mr. W. A., payments to, qu. 3704
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, and, 3705
Government offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Grasshopper pest, 596
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Seed-cleaning stations, 600
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973

Mayberry, Col. Thomas R., 286

Meaford, Ont., wharf, 983

Meagher, Mr. N. H. *See* Disallowance

Meats. *See also* Bacon; Cold Storage; Live Stock; Treaties
Canned, inspection, 2202
Chilled and preserved, shipment to Great Britain, 463, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fresh and cured
Exports, 1984
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
Inspection. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Meat products, lard, 1978
Pork products, French treaty, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978

Mechanics. *See* Labour

Medals. *See* War, Medals

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions

Medical Care. *See* Health; Indians

Medical Course, length of, 2934

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance

Medical Inspections. *See* Health; Immigration; Pensions

Medical Research. *See also* Scientific Research
Banting, Dr. *See that title*
Helium, discoveries by Doctors McLennan and Macallum, 703, 4439
Insulin treatment, discovery of, 703. *See also* Banting
Standardizing and testing laboratories, 703

Medical Students. *See* Universities

Medicine Hat
Customs employees, qu. 3505
Dominion lands office, 3250

Medicines and Drugs. *See also* Health; Narcotic Drugs
"Metagen", analysis of, qu. 1867
Patenting, 703, 2077, 2078
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261

Medicines and Drugs—*Con.*
Proprietary or patent, 700
Supplies for hospitals. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Hospitals

Mediterranean
Fish from Maritime provinces, 3002
Steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636

Meductic-New Brunswick boundary line, 4309

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply, 17. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 18; delay in co-ordination and amalgamation of Canadian National Railways, 18-19; Grand Trunk not yet amalgamated with Canadian Nationals; railway expenditure without authority of parliament; immigration policy of government, 19; export of grain crop; export of settlers' effect, 20-21; no government policy to check emigration, provide employment or reduce taxation, 21; natural resources of western provinces; the tariff question; customs collections, 22; national debt increased under present administration, 22-23; decrease in respect to soldiers' pensions, increase in sales tax; added burden of taxes; post office revenue and the stamp tax, 23; late government and reorganization of departments, 24; Great Britain paying off a portion of her national debt, 24; conduct of Dominion finances during war years, 24; western Canada and the harvest of 1922; sounder agricultural conditions; Canada anxious for peace and prosperity; Near East crisis, 25; removal of cattle embargo, 25-26; condition of the western farmer; Bank Act revision, 26; redistribution, 27
Alleged understanding, Mr. Shaw's amendment, 987
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Agricultural conditions, 1853
Committee reports, 1209, 4363
Great Britain in, 1861
Leitch, Prof., dairy industry, 1858
Luxuries, demand for, 1856
Agricultural implements duty, 2246, 2990
Reduction by Conservative government, 2756
Speech of 1910, 2848
Agricultural products, distribution, 1857
Agriculture, estimates, 575

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Alpine Club grant, 3415
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annual drill, 863, 4635
Appointments by government, 2502
Artificial silk, duty, 2990, 3489
Arts, literature and science, recognition, 1289
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084
Attorney General, Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2560
Auditor General, vacancy, 3307, 4512
Australia, trade treaty with, 245, 1849, 1850
Banff park, water powers, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4133-4160
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on, 4143
Newspaper articles, Montreal Standard, 4143
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 496
Bank charters, renewal of, 4143
Bank mergers, 4138
Banking and Commerce Com. proceedings, 4143
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3213-14
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4437
Belgium, treaty with, 246
Belle River wharf, 4594
M. to reduce 4600, neg. 4610
Personal explanation, 4638
Binder twine, duty free, 4379
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, 6
Board of Commerce, 2558, 2571
Boots and shoes, free entry to United States, 3499
Breweries and export liquor houses, 1636
British and foreign news service, 4712
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1546, 1547
Liquor law administration, 2425
British preference, 453
Fifty per cent, 3049
Increase, 3487
Woollen goods, 3460
Brussels postmaster, 1800
Budget, 2984; expressions of good will towards Finance Minister; courtesy and frankness; budget disappointing; omissions from presentation; what a budget should contain; analysis of financial position and trade conditions; budget speeches in Great Britain and Australia; public debt, 2984; additions to; demobilization and war

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
responsibilities; revenues collected during the war; comparison with Great Britain and Australia; taxation of incomes and war profits, 2985; returns for war expenditure; per capita debt; demand for a balanced budget; debt reduction by sale of war material; expenditure, reduction of, 2986; railway obligations; soldiers' civil re-establishment; pensions; soldier settlement; housing; unemployment; expenditure and revenue; tax reductions and debt increases; sugar duty; reduction; refiners' protection not interfered with, 2987; rigid adherence to protective principle; depreciated currency clause; marking clause; orders in council; two favoured industries; lead pencils; lithographic works; dumping clause; tobacco duty, cigarettes, 2988; bootlegging in tobacco; injury to tobacco-manufacturing industry; beet sugar duty; proposals of budget of 1923; British preferential tariff; reasons for changes not apparent; combines and mergers; woollen industry; duty on raisins and currants, 2989; French treaty debate recalled; tariff increase to facilitate negotiations with Australia; artificial silk duty; inconsistency of government; protection principles intact; woollens, tariff reduction and price; farm implements, reduction of duty, 2990; reduction in output and advance in prices; moderate protection; free trade sentiment not making progress; United States competition, 2991; protection cannot be abandoned; reciprocity offer; no change in opinion on question; arguments against reciprocity; geographical considerations; industrial and agricultural competition; organization and production; no guarantee of permanency, 2992; abrogation of the treaty of 1854; termination of recent trade arrangement; trade reprisals, 2993; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; fidelity to political pledges flouted; statements of Mr. Euler, Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Fielding; responsibility of Minister of Finance for Liberal Convention; Prime Minister and the "chart"; declaration of Prime Minister in 1920, 2994; con-

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
vention of Alberta Liberals; endorsement of Liberal platform, 2995; double-dealing policy; appeal to the farmer, assurance to the business man; stability; apostacy of western ministers; declaration for free food and implements of production, 2996; vote in 1919 on the resolution of Mr. McMaster; new taxation unaccompanied by economy; sales tax; declarations of Prime Minister in 1921, 2987; business profits and luxury taxes; pyramiding of taxes; cost of living, comparison of Canadian and United States prices; whole tax passed on to consumer; exempted articles, 2998; addition of newsprint to list; raw wool; agricultural implements; review of government taxation records; necessities of life; implements of production; luxuries; French treaty; embroideries; boots and shoes; wines and brandies; cost of living, 2999; descending curve succeeded by upward movement; professions of economy; direct taxation and "invisible" tariff; political shilly-shally; government losing ground; heroic policy needed; needs of the West and the Maritime provinces, 3000
Speech,
Comment on, 3047, 3077
Revenue statements omitted, 2860, 2898
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House, 179
Adjournments
Early, 74
Hour of, 382, 3208, 3261
Bills
Alteration of, 3449
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3976
Business for to-morrow, 3750
Closure, Rule 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
Committees
Conduct, review by House, 3270
Discussion of questions not referred, 3268
Voting in, 4611
Legislation
Old age pensions, 2518
Pending, 2518, 3265, 3452
Motions
Anticipatory, 3327, 3329
Non-debatable, ruling of Mr. Speaker, 4076
Order of, 4163

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Post office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' day, 1158, 1161-2
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Answers to, 343, 1385
Dropping of, 4511
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 1139, 1385, 4303
Right to put on Orders of the Day, 734
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Resolutions, explanations on, 3483
Returns, inquiry for, 2208, 2394, 3324, 3962, 4513
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4295
Rules
Closure, 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
M. (Mr. Johnston) for special committee, 1301
Supply
Amdt. to amdt. 1301
Motion to postpone, 3667
Procedure, 179
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report of debates, 3285
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada Grain Act administration, 4710
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canada's participation in war, M. (Mr. Power) 1537
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2425
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3827, 3830
Construction without tender and contract, 957
Cost per ton, 957
Policy, 3827
Vote under closure, 4598
Canadian National parks and historic sites
Expenditure, 3941
Water powers, 3939
Canadian National Railways
Advances, $13,099,493.34, 1753
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 34, 58, 2471
Economies resulting, 1616
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 4303-39, 4397, 4689
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4303, 4339, 4397
Amdts. 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Finance, 4329, 4337
Rejection by Senate, 4695

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, 57, 1615
Acquisition of, 1937
Coal purchases, 4708
United States, 3494
Committee on, 2473
Deficits, 1613
Directors, board of. *See also under this title,* Management
Additional director, Quebec, inquiry, 34
Labour representation of, 1653
Removal of late, correspondence, 3962
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Equipment orders, 2701
Estimates, 1620
Expenditure, 4304
Express and electric lines, 2470
Fixed charges, 1614
Grand Trunk and, 1562
Arbitration, 60
Gratuities to directors and officials
Royal commission 1665, 1668, 1976
Condon, Mr. F. T., K.C., 2297, 2502
Operating results, 1613
Shareholders, list of, 940
Hanna, Mr. D. B., resignation, 1666
Insurance, 1616
Mortgaged premises, 1635, 2048
Management. *See also under this title,* Directors
Changes in, 1612
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., 1612
Non-interference with from day to day, 2473
Responsibilities and powers, 3653, 3677 3687
Resolution of 1921, 3688
System of, 2472
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Minister's annual statement, 1612
Paris offices, purchase, 3208, 3653, 3676, 3683, 3687
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), Chairman's ruling, 3667
Forke, Mr., reference to, 3675
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Real estate transactions, 2518
Revaluation, 2860
Robb, Mr. 2471
Securities, approval of, bill 4403, 4516
Expenditure to be voted by parliament, amdt. 4527, neg. 4528
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Appointment, correspondence, 495
Traffic staff, removal to Halifax, 4708

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, 1615
Unification of systems, 1616
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See under this title,* Labour, International Labour Conference
Cattle embargo, removal of, 575
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
Cheque tax, 3923
Chinese immigration, 1441
Estimates, 1443
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-34, 4536
Cigarette duty, 2988, 3230
Civil Service
Appointments, 208
Bonus, 1811, 1814
Commission, appointment of postmasters, 1798, 1829
Political partisanship, 286
Reform, 409
Superannuation, 3402
Work outside regular duties, 1675
Civil Service Act
Abuse of, 3254
Combines staff, appointment, 2661
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 356, 368, 374, 529, 550
Special committee, 937
First report, 1256
Civilization, evolution of, 1856
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal. *See also under this title* Fuel,
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Reciprocity, 3497
Combines, 2989
Printing, 1623
Combines bill, 496, 990, 992, 2519, 2556, 2604, 2607, 2624-29, 2660-68
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2560
Civil Service Act, violation of, 2661
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Legislation, history of, 2557
Privy Council judgment, 2559
Registrar, appointment of, 2628
Commissioner, and, 2558
Senate amendments, 3505

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2559
Appeals, 2051
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 484
Conferences, 3411
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C., appointment, 2297, 2502
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Copper bounty bill, 4370, 4374
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2345
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 1860
Cost of living, 1684, 1812, 2999
Increase of, 1812, 1853
Sales tax and, 1813
Cotton fabrics for pneumatic tires, 3487
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Inquiry, 1483
Publication of evidence in marriage and divorce proceedings, 1971
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1929. *See also under this title* Freight rates
Extension, 2741
"Cuckoo" government, 3451, 3510
Customs duties, reduction, 90
Customs tariff items, passing of, 3486
Dairy Industry Act, Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Deceased members, tributes to, 6
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1805, 1808
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1806
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2364, 4678
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dominion archives building, 1730
Dominion arsenals, 887, 1752
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4365
Dominion lands and parks
Contingencies, 3408
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Salaries, 3250
Dominion Textile Company, stock, 1853
Dredging. *See also under this title,* Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 1012
Manitoba, 1013
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Unification of work, 3341
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Dry red lead, etc., duty, 3481
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2252
Editorial Committee 1670, 1675-86, 1714
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Emigration to the United States, 211, 1093, 1657

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Emigration—*Con.*
Montreal, from, 2216
New York Tribune, reported statement of, 2790
Esquimault dry dock, 2671
Estimates.
Canadian National Railways, expenditure, 4304. *See also that title*
Commitments, 4598
Obligations maturing 1754
Supplementary, 4420
Time of presentation, 4420, 4422, 4594, 4605, 4703
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1817
Experimental farms, 484
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4012, 4354
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742
Finance Act, 255
Firebrick duty, 3482, 3896
Fiset Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. bill 4009
Forest protection, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
France
Imports and exports, 2015
Trade arrangements, termination, 1999
War losses, 2215
Free trade
Great Britain in, 1860
Not making progress, 2991
Freight rates, 3194
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1948
Suspension of, 1948
Equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1307, 1928
Manitoba, 1931, 1932
Shipping. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates
Legislation, 3265, 4710
Westward from prairie provinces, 1158
French-speaking deputy ministers, 1806, 1808
French treaty, 440, 456
Analysis 449
Border states, 440, 450, 2215
British preference, 453
Concessions to United States, 449
Consideration of, inquiry, 1740
Luxuries, 450
French treaty bill, 2013, 2209, 2239, 2242, 2259-63, 2299-2304, 3910
Agricultural implements, 2246
Boots and shoes, 2240
Brandy, 2302
Bronze powder, 2016, 2217

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
French Treaty bill—*Con.*
Butter, 2217
Buttons, 2214
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Embroideries, 2214
Exports and imports, 2222
Exports to France, 2210, 2213
Favoured nation, 2210, 2213, 2402
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Livestock, 2211
Luxuries, 2213, 2259
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2212, 2259
Revenue, loss of, 2209
Sales tax, 2299
Silks, 2215
Specific duties 2215
Treaty of 1907, 2212
Value of, 2210
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wines, 2302
Fuel supply, 790
Children, death of, 751, 1657
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey estimates, 2504, 2508
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 338
Government commissions, appointments of, 2502. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Government publications. *See also under this title,* Editorial Committee
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste, Judge Snider's report, 1715
Grain and grain trade
Grain inquiry commission, 1210, 4710
Delay in appointment, 2254
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Grain sample market, 304
Grain shipments, Quebec elevator, 3768
Halifax elevator, 4713
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695
Great Britain
Depression in, 1854
Free trade, 1860
Taxation, 2796
Great Lakes disarmament, 244, 247, 494
Grant, Dr., civil service, 558
Graving docks, 2682
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3254
Grondines wharf, 959
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Halibut fishery treaty, 4456-79
Correspondence with British government, 1032
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Halibut fishery treaty—*Con.*
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4480
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title,* Dredging
Estimates, 2671
Manitoba, 993
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Saskatchewan and Alberta 1001
Tenders for repair work, 950
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1692
Hector celebration grant, 4636, 4705
Helmer, Mr., appointment, 3254
Hemp bounty bill, 3912, 4378, 4384
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4658
Homesteads
Inspectors, 3252
Second, 4365
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 3226
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Housing legislation, 2518, 2987
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4683
Correspondence, 208
Feasibility of route, 1069
History of, 1076
Letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co., claim, 4690
M. (Mr. Knox) 1075
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686
Rail removals, qu. 203
Senate investigation, 1076
Welland canal and, 3787
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigraton. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Advertising, 1085
Black, Mr. W. J., appointment, 2664
Canada Colonization Association
Agreement with, 1321
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1334
Field supervisors, Soldier Settlement Board, 1090-2
Chinese. *See under this sub-title,* Oriental
Estimates, 1387
Hindu, 4640, 4658
Ingram, Mr., appointment, 2664
Late administration and, 1335
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1086
May, Mr., appointment, 2663
Oriental
Chinese, 1441, 1443, 2327-34, 4536

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1262
Japanese, 1450
Legislation, principle of, 2328
Policy, 1164, 1335
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2430, 2669
Legislation of 1919, 2431
Undesirable classes, 2669
Vessel crews, 2671
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Egypt, British policy, 4663
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495, 4504
Indians, 2154
Agents, 2162
Perth, N.B., 2154
Cattle, 2162
Doctors, Portage la Prairie, appointments, 2160
Education, 2158
Greater production, 2155
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Reorganization, 2162
St. Peter's reserve, hay lands, 2154
Treatment of, 2158
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4359
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3230, 3969, 4528
Inspection of livestock shipments, 3334
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3045
International boundaries, surveys, 3246
International Labour Conference. *See under this title.* Labour
Italian treaty bill, 2401-04, 2701
Favoured nation, 2402
Lord Curzon, signature, 2403
Japanese fishing licenses, 1547
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status of, 202
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3265
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 6
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1668
Labour
Department
Estimates, 1621
Reduction of officials, 524
Drift to United States, 1812. *See also under this title* Emigration

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1648
Incomplete return, 1539
Report of last meeting, 1442
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Organizing power of, 1857
Labour Gazette, cost of printing, 1621, 1708, 1712
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 227
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 6
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 3265, 4710
Lake of the Woods
Control, M. for papers, 247
Levels, 247, qu. 2700
Lake of the Woods bill, 2886, 4163, 4165
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands, Immigration
Homesteads, 3252, 4365
Soldier settlement, 2019. *See also under this title,* Soldier Settlement
Speculation and taxation, 1395
Laurier monument, 1017
Legislation, record of, 407, 408
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250
Liberal appointments by late government, 2503
Liberal Convention of 1919, 2994
British preference, 454
French treaty, 2211
Labour res. 1651
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on Bank Act, 4143
Library of Parliament, 2693
Life-saving service, 3335
Lindsay arsenal, 884
Linen yarn duty, 3898
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment, 1764
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.
Appointment to Bench, 1764, 1810
Retirement, 2392
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 849
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Marine and Fisheries
Committee report, 3084
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3293, 3303, 3320
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Live stock shipments, 3334
Salary, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Masters and mates, examination, 2610

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Mennonites
Contract with, 1885
Emigration of, 1884
Merchants' bank investigation, 4159
Militia and Defence disbursements, 345
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3976
Mines department, salaries, 3207
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways, appointment, 519
Ministers' and officials' travels, 343
Moderate protection, 2991
Moose Jaw election
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 1686
Murdock, Hon. Mr., 1714
National Defence
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 887, 1752
Estimates, 1751
Pay of staff, 890
Salaries and contingencies, 902
National gallery, 1019
National ownership, 93
Natural resources, western provinces, 2782
Expenditure upon, 2510
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2188, 2191, 2195, 2440-63
Judges, 2446, 2451
Favourable report necessary to issue of certificate, 2440
Secretary of State
Administration by, 2440
Certificates, issue, 2440
Powers of, 2188
Naval service, 902
Department, 3341
Navigation schools, 3332
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Near East crisis, 25, 31
New departmental building, Ottawa, architects, 4633
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
North Essex by-election, 4595. *See also under this title,* Belle River
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2014
Fielding, Hon. Mr. and, 2013
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480, 4487. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Nova Scotia strikes, troops, 868, 898
Offensive partisanship, 3344
Oil bounty, 2511
Old age pensions, legislation, 2518
Oleomargarine
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3449

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
Inquiry, 1309, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 2519, 3526, 3536, 3573
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Precedence, 3271, 3451
Point of order, Mr. Sutherland, 3327
Ontario
Elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4162
Number of members, 252
Orders in Council, 1027
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354, 4487
Repeal by statute, 3504
Ore flotation, 2509
Ore-testing plants, British Columbia, 2509
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Ottawa Typographical Union, copyright, 2144
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Pan-American union, 496
Paper. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Control, 2573
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Prices in Canada and United States, 829
Parliament buildings, cost, 1725
Parliamentary government, 1652
Patents of Invention bill, 2129
Penitentiaries, 771
Penny Bank of Toronto bill, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703, 4746, 4748
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
Federal appeal board, 4703
Old age, 1651, 2518
Women, 1651
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4162
Petition of right, fiats, 3226
Petroleum and Naptha Inspection bill, 3969
Pledges, violation of, 2220
Point of order, relevancy, 2663
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Policies, review of, 408, 409
Political patronage, 2160, 3344
Population, increase of, 1398
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Indians, medical service, 2160
Sewerage system, 993, 2679
Postmaster General, absence of, 1314, 1538
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Post Office department
Administration, 1817
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1825
Revenue attributable to postal service, 1817
Ross, Mr. George W., retirement, 1825
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prices. *See also under this title,* Budget; Cost of living
Agricultural products and manufactured goods, 1853
Producer and consumer, 1853
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4678
Printing
Contracts to newspapers, etc., 2394
Reduction in cost, 1671
Printing bureau, new building, 1735
Fire hazard, 1736
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Privilege
Carroll, Mr., 3267
Committee, discussion, anticipatory, 3267
Production costs and labour organization, 1857
Progressive party, Union government and big interests, 1853
Promissory notes, tax, 3923
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389, 410
M. (Mr. Good) 406, 430
Protection, increase in industries, 2798
Public buildings
New departmental, 1729
Nova Scotia, 4612
Renting or building, 1736
Public debt, responsibility for, 2920
Public expenditure. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Estimates
Public Service Act Amdt. bill, 3402
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950-5
Public works, committments, 962
Publication of evidence, etc., 1971
Publicity agent, London, Mr. W. T. Cranfield 2927, 2983, 4707
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4012, 4354
Royal commission, 3412, 3413, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Quebec
Champlain dock, 2675
Grain elevator, 3768
Statutes of, 1660
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2467
Railway Commission, 3192

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Railway Commission—*Con.*
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Minister of Agriculture, 3192
Criticism of, 3192
Railways. *See also under this title,* Canadian National
Branch lines, 1735
Financial situation, 1753
Railways and Canals, Minister, appointment, 1081
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Reciprocity with United States
Agreement of 1911, 3902
Agricultural implements, 3499
Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A., 2922
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
Offer to negotiate, 3901, 3908
Permanency, 3079
Request for information, 3504
Redistribution, 27, 162, 487
Ivel, Mr. W. M., 733
Special Committee on bill, 937
Printing of proceedings, 3399
Report, 4736
References to, 89-96. *See also speeches* on Budget
Returned soldiers
Appointment, 1800
Civil Service appointments, 1797
Revised Hansard, inquiry, 122
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1849, 3475
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1149
Reason for increase in force, 1149
Royal Canadian navy, 902
Recruiting for volunteer reserve, 2898
Rural credit system, 4144
Rural population, 1854
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John harbour improvements, 2677
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., 1006
St. Lawrence river waterway, qu. 204, 3786
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Second homesteads, 4365
Secretary of State dept. estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 4367
Seed testing bill, 2304
Senate estimates, 2694
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 2996

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Singapore naval base, 3822
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Expenditure, 2894
Walkerville, alleged statement at, 2014
Reference to, 670, 708
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 2892
Soldier settlement, 2987
Advertising, 2023
Expenditure, 2018
Land taxation, 3260
Legal expenses, 2018
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 4364, 4409
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 7
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; French Treaty
Agricultural implements, 2756
Election pledges, violation, 1658
Figures, 90
Luxuries, 2015
Policy of government, 3492
Reduction of duties, 2561
Rural population and, 1854
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Address; Budget; Income Tax; Special War Revenue
Increased burden of, 1854
Sales tax, 4409
Imports, 4410
Increase in, 2213
Necessaries of life, 94-5, 2999
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682
Terrebonne public building, 2690
Thornton, Sir Henry, qu. 284, 495. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3208, 3845
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288
Tobacco duties, smuggling, 2989, 3230
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3244
Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Harbour improvements, 985, 2678
Viaduct, 4441
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French; Halibut; Italian
Government and, 1850
Signing of, 4457
Tree-planting, 3416
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 898

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Trusts, 3231. *See also under this title,* Combines
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unemployment, 2987
Minister of Labour, responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
United States. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Borrowings from, 95
Industries in Canada, 4380
Liquor laws, 4295
Obligations to, 23, 93
Unrest, western Canada, 4514
Vancouver harbour bill, 259
Victoria dry dock, 1002
Vimy Ridge memorial, 182
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1747
War profiteering, 2921
Waste paper, sale by government, 1714
Water powers, forest reserves, 1256
Welland canal construction, 3786
Western provinces, conditions, 1854
Wharves, revenue, 977
Wheat board
Establishment of, 409
Extension of legislation, 2696
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Native, 2011
Wingham postmaster, 1800
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Melita, Man. bank robbery, 1147

Melville, Mr. G. D., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

Members of Parliament. *See* House of Commons

Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Emigration; Immigration

Mental Tests, 1219

Merchants' Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
Immigration policy, 1115
Lachine canal bridge, 2299
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Transcontinental, Montreal branch line, qu. 2392

Mergers. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Combines bill

Merit System. *See* Civil Service

"Metagen" analysis of, qu. 1867

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service. *See* Marine

Metric System, qu. 914

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 859, 867
Hamilton public building, 4628
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4588
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3329
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3859
Port Maitland pier, 4589
Sales tax, 4418

Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention of, 2297, 2469

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Bankruptcies among farmers, 1495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3105
Capital punishment, 769
Civil Service salaries, qu. 2086
Dorchester penitentiary, supplies, qu. 494
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4345
Forest protection, M., 816
Fuel supply, qu. 203
Indian agent, Perth, N.B., 2155
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 310
Amdt. 311
Mechanics, qu. 203
New Brunswick forest fires, relief, 4010
Pensions, European war, 3713
Political patronage, 3348
Potatoes
Exports, qu. 621
Industry, 310
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
Steel, L. R. Company, qu. 1994

Michell, Professor, cost of living, 1700, 1812

Michigan Central Railway, bridge, qu. 1257

Middleman. *See* Prices

Midland wharves, 983

Migration. *See* Emigration

Migratory Birds Convention Act, administration, 3443

Militarism, 4652. *See* National Defence, Annual Drill, Cadet Services

Military Camps. *See* Petawawa

Military Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner); War

Military Expenditures. *See* National Defence

Military Hospitals. *See* Hospitals

Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See* Labour, Strikes; National Defence

Militia and Defence. *See* National Defence

Militia Pensions. *See* Pensions

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bills
1. Retired war officers in Public Service.
Res. 1740, 2052; 1r., com., 2053; 3r., 2086
2. Period of service entitling to pensions.
Res. 3582, 3975; 1r., 2r., com., 3976; 3r., 3977

Milk. *See* Dairying Industry; Prices

Mill Feeds, adulteration. *See* Agriculture; Feeding Stuffs Act; Grain and Grain Trade; Milling Industry

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply, 50. Unemployment question, 50; immigration; soldier land settlement; Canada Colonization Association, 51; lake grain rates; deep waterways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; com. on agricultural conditions, 52; marketing of grain, 53
Agricultural expenditure, 3239
Agricultural implements, standardization, 789, 805
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2135, 2137
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4081-4113
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Binder twine industry, 4386
Canada Grain Act, administration, 784
Canadian Air Force, Saskatchewan, 1784
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3407, 3434
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4336
Paris offices, 3610
Cattle shipped to Great Britain, 2135
Report as to tuberculosis, 2469
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Cold storage companies, 188
Combines bill, 2546
Copper bounty, 3239

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 3152
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4670
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4368
Dominion lands and parks, 3252
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Experimental farms, 469, 485
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4407
Freight rates, shipping, 3763, 3787
Fuel supply, 792, 805, 3205
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Dockage, 784
Government, mixing, 2036
Screenings, 2039
Sheep feeding, 2040
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commission, appointment, 1763
Marketing and shipment, 53, qu. 494
Amendment, 311
Insurance, 3764
Motion, 288
Shipping rates, 3787. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates bill
Grants to military associations, 889
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Health of animals, 576
Historic sites, 3407, 3434
Hogs
Cholera contracted from whey, 3299
Grading, 591
Homestead inspectors, 3252, 3254
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1057
Immigration, Canada Colonization Association, 51
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4497
Interest rate, 4111
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4221-33
Lightkeepers salaries, 3352
Live Stock Acts Amdt., 276
Live stock industry, 469
National gallery, 1019
National monument, Connaught place, 2688
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2457, 3985
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Judges, 2457
Naturalization, obstacles in way of, 2457
Oil-drilling, southern Alberta, 2508
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions, European war, 3722
Public expenditure, 4422
Public works, apportionment of, 4561
Quebec wharves, 980
Rural mail delivery, 1790

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
St. Lawrence river
Ship channel, 3340, 3343
Waterway, report, 3428
Sales tax, 4422
M. (Mr. Stevens) 922
Saskatchewan wharves, 1001
Seed Purchasing Commission, qu. 279
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, qu. 206, 2021
Special war revenue, 4422
Tree-planting stations, 3413
Tuberculous cattle, fraudulent trade, 485, 576
Vancouver harbour bill, 262, 263
Wages, 3205
Water power leases, 3426
Welland canal construction, 3763, 3787
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345

Miller Bill. *See* Race Track Betting

Miller, Mr. Roger, claim, 4676

Millerand, Mons. A., President French Republic, 1538

Milling Industry. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act; Flour; Grain and Grain Trade
Millers, conference, 604
Millfeeds. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act
Adulteration of, 600, 2875
Legislation, inquiry, 2795
Milling in bond, 2960
Protection, 146-147
Selection of wheat for milling, 2980

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Binder twine, price, 4387
Experimental farms, 470
Fuel oil, standardization, 808
Fuel supply, 808
Gasoline, short measure, 810
Hemp bounty bill, 4387
White Mud river, fishway, 3362

Milner, Lord, credit and industry, 627

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Fuel; Geological Survey
Asbestos, 460, 2750
Assay office, Vancover, 3207
Cobalt, 2750. *See also* Treaties, French
Committee, 3204
Changes in membership, 1483, 2047
Failure to function, 1271
Reports
Coal on, 4514, 4743
First, 1384, 1738
Second, 1738
Third, 4436, 4592

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, 3235
Copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 3035. *See also* Bounties; Copper
Customs drawback, 2655
Rod mill, opening of, 2943
Copper Mountain, 2504
Department
Deputy minister, Mr. Camsell, 1265
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Publications, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207
Dome Mines Company, 4209
Explosives division, 2514
Fuel-testing division, 3197
Gaspé, 1242
Gold. *See also that title*
Labrador gold discovery, 1995, 2611, qu. 2696
Output, 2750
Percentage of national wealth, 2720
Gypsum, 2349
Plaster quarries and, 1010
Hudson bay region, 1049, 1076. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
Alberta coal, 1163
Edmonton, 1268
Iron ores
Alberta 2512
Deposit, Vancouver island, 2514
Irrigation, rights of leaseholders. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
Miners' strikes. *See* Labour
Mining companies
Dividends. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
Shares, 4208
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Nickel, 2750
Shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Ontario Goldfields, 4209
Ores
Flotation, 2509
Ore-dressing division, 3197
Ore-testing, Nelson, B.C., 2505
Shipment to Ottawa testing plant, 2505
Precious metals, content of, 4371
Quartz mining in Yukon, 249
Queen Charlotte islands, 150
Revenue from leases, 2510
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Silver production, 2750
Sudbury copper mines, 4371

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Trail, B. C., smelter, 2861, 3235
Refractory ores, 2506
Yukon, 86-89, 249. *See also that title*
Exhibit, British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Mayo silver strike, 3943

Mining Companies. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill

Mining Leases. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill

Mining Rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act; Yukon Act Amdt. bill

Ministers of the Crown
Absence of, 2934, 3043. *See also* Murphy, Hon. Charles
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Appointed acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
Number of, 3043
Salaries, 4671. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act
Proposed reduction of 12½ per cent, M. (Mr. Leader) 1153, 2915
Travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1848-9 2815, 3017, 3474-5

Minorities, Senate and, 1377

Miramichi River fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Miscellaneous Private Bills. *See* Private Bills

Miscou-Shippegan Steamship service, 2173

Mitchell, Mr. A. J. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Interest in insurance companies, 2050

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140, 4145
Banking and Commerce Com., Mr. D. C. Macarow, 4145
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2390

Mixing of Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Modus Vivendi. *See* Fish and Fisheries; United States

Moncton, N.B.
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, 1756
Transfer to Montreal, 574
Headquarters, 13, 2971
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307

Moncton and Buctouche Railway, qu. 203, 3646, 4197

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Prices; Public Expenditure; Purchasing Power
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666
Origin and function of, 632, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 44, 1167, 1168, 4666

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Monk, the late Hon. F. D. *See* Proportional Representation

Monopolies. *See* Combines

Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912

Montreal (city)
Canadian National headquarters, suitability, 62-63
Chamber of Commerce, Bankruptcy Act, 1492
Coal situation, 254
Customs house and revenue, 3280
Daylight saving, post office, qu. 3143
Emigration, 2216
Skilled mechanics, 2790
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, 2719
Ordnance stores building, 1022
Post office
Appointments, 1800
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Postal stations
Number of, qu. 3135
Postal station "G", qu. 623
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Public Works employees, 381
Transcontinental railway, connection, qu. 2393
Unemployment, 42, 2719
Union stockyards, 2762

Montreal (port). *See* also Vancouver Harbour Bill
Cold storage warehouse, 185, 272, qu. 1633, qu. 1488, qu. 2204, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt
Grain elevator
Capacity, 3767
Grand Trunk, qu. 1974
New, qu. 1663
Grain shipments, 1768, qu. 1973, 1974, 4230
Shortages, complaint of British importers, 1764, 2037
United States grain handling, 1760
Wheat shipments, qu. 385

Montreal (port)—*Con.*
Harbour commission. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
Advances, qu. 812, 4363, 4508
Lumber importations, qu. 1867
Names and salaries, qu. 1137
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Montreal Corn Exchange, lake tonnage, 4289

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Advance of $10,000,000.)
Res. 4363; 4508; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4508

Montreal Shipping Federation. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Vessel crews, 2670

Montreal Standard editorial, Bank Act, 4125, 4142

Monuments and Memorials. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; War
Baker, Late Lieut Col. G. H., M.P., 435, 730
Champlain monument, Orillia, 4705
Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, 3433
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 1017
Law, the late Bowman B., 1020
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, 4704
Vimy Ridge monument, 811. *See also that title*

Moore, Mr. Tom, President Dominion Trades Congress, 1170
Immigration, 1167
Labour
Eight-hour day, 1427
Representative on Canadian National board, 1652-6, 3636

Moose Jaw. *See also* Elections; Johnson, R. M.
By-election, 2224, 2760
Announcement of vacancy, 615
Certificate, Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Eggs, price of, 1852
Hopkins, Mr. E. N.
Congratulations to, 2760
Introduction, 2417
Hudson Bay railway
Alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell. 1686, 2774, 2787, 4683
Promises, 1073
Murdock, Hon. Mr. 1714
Oleomargarine, 3536
Results, 2760

Moose Jaw—*Con.*
By-election—*Con.*
Return, delay, 2295
Tariff, one of main issues, 2714
Income tax office, qu. 2699
Member for and reciprocity agreement, 3010
Public building, 1023
Stockyard, 2779

Moose Mountain
Forest reserve, 3453
Pleasure resort, 3408, 3453

Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259

Morel, Mr. E. D. *See* Germany, Reparations

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3211
Canada, constitutional development, 4469
Halibut fishery treaty, 4469
Imperial Conference, 4653
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Translation of bill, 4435
Treaties, signing of, 4469

Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028

Morrisburg and Waddington ferry, qu. 1029

Morrisburg dam, 1270

Morrison, Mr. D. W., postmaster, St. Peter's, N.S. qu. 1488, 1489

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2928. Congratulations to Finance Minister; agricultural conditions; prices of agricultural and manufactured products;purchasing power; manufacturing overhead; "calamity howlers"; British preference; further increase; combines; shipping; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2928; trade with Great Britain and the United States; high duties interfering with trade; cigarettes; immigration; branch lines; emigration to the United States; farm credits; rural credits; commission on banking and credits; unjust treatment of farmers by banks; United States credit service; amortization plan; Canadian Pacific railway, land sale contracts; copper; artificial silk and hemp bounties; assistance to capitalists

Morrison, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
but nothing for the farmer; budget a step backwards; high protectionists in Liberal party; camouflaged Tories masquerading under false colours; reciprocity, defeat of in 1911, 2931; Conservatives true to false principles; Liberals false to true principles; election promises not carried out; Liberal platform of 1919 treated as scrap of paper, 2932
Cold Storage bill, 187, 189, 275
Economic conditions, 1238
Farm labourers, wages and dwellings, 1240
Forestry, fire prevention, 4346
Hudson Bay railway, 98
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1240
Literature, 1239
Policy, 1238
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Land, sale of to immigrants, 1091
Postmasters, appointment of returned soldiers, 1799
Tariff as it affects East and West, 2753
Western provinces, conditions in, 1238
Woollen industry
British preference, 3471
Protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 933

Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater claim, 4572, 4722

Mortgaged Premises, Insurance. *See* Canadian National Railway Bills

Mortgages. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Farms, Mortgages

Moss, Mr. H. R., illegal arrest, 2030

Mothers' Pensions. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd system, 577. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Special committee, 667, 706
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agriculture department
Dairy branch activities, 3283
Deputy minister
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Salary, 611
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3988, 4674
Salaries and contingencies, 610
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Alberta coal, freight rates, 3201
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 666, 2047, 2131. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290
Bacon
Grading, 593
Salty, 3301
Bees, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Bounties, copper and hemp, 2778
Budget, 2756. Tariff of Sir John Macdonald on agricultural implements; civil service, increase of; Department of Agriculture, staff; civil government, cost of; estimates, preparation of, 2756; grain shipments; stream of wealth from the West; wheat board; demands from the West; idle statements and threats; no turning back; cattle shipments, space on ships; Manitoba Free Press, 2757; Canadian Government Merchant Marine and cattle shipments; letter from Mr. R. B. Teakle; letter from Sir Henry Thornton, 2758; fictitious demand for space; rates, 2759; cattle embargo, removal of; Moose Jaw election; Atlantic shipping rates; conference in Great Britain; report of North Atlantic Conference; rate on Canadian and United States flour, 2761-2; union stockyards, 2762; agricultural conditions; Maritime provinces; specialized farming; potato-growing in New Brunswick; fruit industry, 2763; Quebec; co-operative cold storage; silos and ensilage; farming on poor land; farm credits, 2764; dairying; Ontario fruit-growing; pre-cooling plants; dairy industry; modernized methods; antipodean competition; butter and cheese, 2765; grading; western provinces; dairying; improved methods; cold storage; diversified farming; chief industry; grain-growing, 2766; failures and successes, 2767; debt, 2768; farm credits; dairying; Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, record production; debts of municipalities; unpaid taxes, 2769; Saskatchewan farm loan bonds bought by farmers; Premier Dunning on economic conditions, 2770; wheat production; cost and selling price; Premier Dunning and the

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
budget, 2771; tariff stability but not finality; agricultural questionaire and answers; mixed farming, 2772; grain unsold, 2773; insect and fungus pests; grasshoppers; live stock and dairy industry; Moose Jaw election; Hudson Bay railway; immigration, 2774; disparagement of the country; opportunities and prospects, 2775; amdt. (Mr. Forke); tariff reduction, Progressive party and; British preference, list of articles admitted at 40 per cent or over of present general tariff rate, 2776; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks; free trade with Great Britain, 2777; reciprocity agreement of 1911; revenue; land values tax; not a protectionist budget; bounties, 2778; assistance to new industries, 2779; excise tax on luxuries; hemp bounty; binder twine, 2780; discrimination against the West; protection of no essential value to prairies; cause of discontent; bad farming, 2781; natural resources; cost of administering; transfer of to western provinces, 2782; terms of settlement discussed with Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2783
Speech, reference to, 2845, 3064
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3819
Cattle shipments. *See also under this title* Cattle
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4316
Management, responsibility and power, 3657
Paris offices, 3657
Canned meats, inspection, 2202
Carvell, Hon. F. B., statement regarding, 3188
Cattle
Cattle embargo
Breeding cattle, 3291
Correspondence, 4295
Removal of, 575, 2760
Shipments
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2758, 3040, 3819
Cattle boats, unsanitary conditions, 2613
Chilled beef, trial shipment, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fat cattle, trial shipment, 3091, 4675

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Vessel space, 1869, 3040
Fictitious demand for, 2759
Cereal rust, 595
Civil Service
Commission, appointments, delay, 3292
Increase of, 2756
Codling moth, 597
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 184, 271-6, 2054, 2055, 2086, 2199
Cold storage plants, 3289
Cheese, 2055
Co-operative, 2764
Pre-cooling, 2056, 2765
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 484. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bills
Butter substitutes, 2518, 3150, 3325
M. for discharge of order, 3325, 3449
Renovated butter, 2961, 4251, 4270, 4344, 4510
Dairying industry, 609, 2765, 3283
Butter grading, 2766, 3283
Butter, pasteurization, 3298
Certified milk, 3300
Cheese grading, 2766, 3283, 3295
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Milk
Filled, 3152
Pasteurizing, 3283
Research laboratory, 3297
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive insect pests, 595, 2774, 3988
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, 3294
Experimental farms, 456-485
Buildings, 4631
Ottawa Central, 481
Farm and Ranch Review, fraudulent stock-yard practices, 576
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4271, 4273, 4538
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Field crop competitions, 602
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 193, 277, 2105, 2131, 3150
Fruit industry, 598, 2763
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, 2307
Grain
Grain-growing, 2766
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar) 301
Unsold, 2773
Grasshopper plague, 596, 2774

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Health of Animals, 575-87, 4676. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle; Live Stock
Contagious diseases, 484
Tuberculosis, 484, 580, 2134, 2469
Eradication, 3989
Tuberculin test, 3300
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hog grading, 594
Horses
Horse-breeding, 589
Market for, 590
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2253
Hudson Bay railway, 2774
Alleged statement, 4683
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3594
Policy, 2774
Progressive members, 2774
"Someone with more money than brains" 1205
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Live Stock, 587. *See also under this title,* Cattle; Horses
Commissioners, visit to South America, 1213
Tuberculosis. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192, 276-7, 2200, 2292, 3150
Penalties, 2203
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Activities, 3310
Appointment, 2614, 3305, 3310
Cattle embargo, reported statements on, 2614
Political partisanship, alleged, 3316
Qualifications, 3306, 3310
Salary, 608, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, in, 3595
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Florida, to, 3311
Great Britain, 3291, 3310, 4675
Millfeeds, adulteration, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs Act
Moose Jaw by-election, reported statement, 1686, 2774
Moose Mountain forest reserve, 3453
Noxious weeds, 2305
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Attitude on, 3576
Dairy Industry Act, correspondence, 3327

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
"Manna" 3152
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3574
Quebec harbour, cold storage, 2055
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 746
Renovated butter, 3151, 4251. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3283, 3288
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed potatoes, inspection of, 2306
Seed purchasing commission, 599
Seed testing bill, 195, 277, 2304
Seeds, purity of, 601
Speeches, pre-election, 2952, 3188
Spruce bud worm, 596
Stock Growers' Protective Association grant, 588
Supply, undiscussed items, 3285
Tariff, attitude on, 2996
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4316
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Tuberculosis in cattle *See under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Winnipeg Free Press, 2790
Woollen industry protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures, fisheries publicity, 3365

Mowat, Capt. Henry, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Mulgrave-Guysboro steamship service, 2173

Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257.

Multi-Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas. *See* Secretary of State

Municipalities
Extravagance, 2797
Historic sites, 3432
Municipal cold storage. *See* Cold Storage
Municipal government in park areas, 3436
Soldiers, hospital treatment, 673
Taxation, 4493. *See also that title*
Irritating, 2804
Land taxes, 1395
School taxes, 3445, 4205
Unpaid, 637, 2953, 2961, 3445, 4205
Tax sales, 2961

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Annuities
Agents for, 1642
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Old age pensions and, 1639, 1651, 1682
Board of Commerce, 2564, 2570
British Empire Steel Corporation employees, 1705
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada National Railways, printing, 1623
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Combines bill, 2562, 2616-34
Definition "combine" 2616
Distribution of report, 2634
Registrar, inquiry, 2620
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2565
Cost of living, 2569
Reference to, 1812
Statistics, 1684
Michell, Prof., 1700
Dominion-provincial labour conference, 1442
Editorial committee, cost, 1669
Emigration to United States, 1657
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 321
Government publications
Distribution, 1712
Waste paper sold, 1713
Hansard
Distribution of, 1715
Revised, inquiry, 122
Immigration, contingencies
M. to reduce, agreed to, 1908
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 1361, 2061
Senate amdts., non-concurrence, 4357
King's Printer, 1669
Labour
Concilliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conference, 1678
Department
Annuities branch, 1639, 1682
Cooperation with provincial departments, 1678
Estimates, 1621, 1637, 1668
Decrease in, 1643
Salaries, 1657, 1668
Staff, reduction of, 1671
Statistics, 1682
Eight-hour day, 1650
Employment offices, 1674
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Employment service director, 1676
St. John, 3453
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 1646, 1702, 1707, 1716

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442
Incomplete return, 1539
Delegates and expenses, 1642
Draft conventions and recommendations, 1441
Papers tabled, 1483
Recommendations
Federal-provincial jurisdiction, 1645
Text, tabled, 1631
Report of last meeting, 1442
Joint Industrial councils, 1654
King's Printer, 1668
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Provincial departments, 1706
Right to organize, 2889
Strikes, 1628, 1702
Nova Scotia miners, 915, 1627, 1716
Sydney steel workers, 287
Thetford Mines, 2207
Year, 1922. M. (Sir Henry Drayton) 245 495, 815
Technical Education
Administration, 1637
Director of, 1674
Labour Gazette
Correspondents, 1626
Editor, 1671
Expenses, 1624
Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1625-6
International Labour Conference, report, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1625, 1708, 1712
Ministers of the Crown, number, 3043
Moose Jaw, by-election, 1714
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3456
Pensions, old age, 1648. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Post office supplies, purchase, 3953
Powell River Paper Company
Labour organization, 2889
Speech, reference to, 3072
Printing bureau
Employees, 1623
New building, 1731, 1735
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Printing contracts to newspapers, 2394, 2614
Purchasing Commission, 3953, 4002
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 764
Reference to, 3067
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Unemployment
Federal-provincial responsibility, 1678
Meighen, Mr., responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
Relief, 1644, 1658
Calgary, 1683
Expenditure, 1655
Responsibility for, 1657, 1678
Returned soldiers, 1679
Winnipeg, 435

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Absence through illness, 1538, 1816, 1826
Boulay, Mlle., Sayabec postmistress, 3706, 3756
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
Parliament buildings committee, 1718
Patronage, 1795
Postal treaties, 4529
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528
Railway mail service, 4529

Murray Bay Point au Pic wharf, 973

Murray Stewart, steamer. *See* Marine; Vessels

Musgrave, Governor, 1916

Musk Ox in Barren Lands, evidence of Mr. Stefansson, 1073

Mustapha Kemal. *See* Near East Crisis

Naphtha. *See* Petroleum and Naphtha

Nappan, dairy herd, 2863

Napoleon, Code. *See* Code Napoleon

Napoleonic Wars
Agricultural products and rents, 1858
Conditions following, 1231

Narcotic Drugs
Export of, 698
International conference, 698
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 1443
Enforcement by Mounted Police, 1142
Prosecutions, 698

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill
(Consolidation; appeals; identification; penalties)
1r., 1136; 2r., com., 2114; 3r., 2124; Senate amdts; 3149

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of, 2120
Certificate of Dominion analyst, 2119
Definitions, 2114
Deportation, convicted alien, 2123
Importing or exporting without license, 2114
Licenses and fees, 2114
Liniments, ointments, etc. 2117
Onus of proof, 2117, 3149
Opium
Resort, being in, 2117
Smoking, 2117
Penalties, 3149
Persons to whom drugs may be sold, 2115
Physicians, veterinary surgeons, dentists, 2115
Power to search for drugs, 2120
Records, not keeping, 2115

National Council of Women, Mrs. James Carruthers, 1647

National Dairy Council. *See* Dairying

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence
Accounts, qu. 205
Active militia, pensions, 2166, 3706
Ammunition, 884
Artillery, 1740
MacBrien, General, 1742
Great Britain from, statement, 1740
Quantity in store, 1741
Small arms, 1741, 1743
Annual training. *See under this title,* Militia
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1024
Haileybury, 4615
Minto Street, Winnipeg, qu. 2084
Army, mental tests, 1219
Arsenals, 2165
Lindsay, 883, 1744
Quebec, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 877, 1743
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749
Approaches to, improvement, 1749, 4565
Building and equipment, acquisition of, 1777
Desertions, 2418
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Repair shops, 1750, 1774
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, new, 1774, 1748

National Defence—*Con.*
Canadian Air Force—*Con.*
Expenditure, 2970
Forest patrol, 1776
Royal air force, aeroplanes, gift, 1748
Vickers company, 1748
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Colt machine guns, inventions, 4635
Department
Acting Minister, 2710. *See also* Graham; Macdonald
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., financial controller, 1806, 3342
Estimates, 859, 1740, 1772, 4635
Expenditures by provinces, 3891
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, 1806
Retirement, 891, 3342, 3135
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as Acting Minister, 2295
Naval Service, amalgamation, 3342
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, amalgamation, 3893
Staff reduction, 1773
Survey work, 2508
Disbursements, qu. 344
Engineer services and works, 4638
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Grants to associations, 889
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
May, Miss H. M., compassionate grant, 900
Militarism, 866
Military districts, reduction, 868
Military expenditure, 858, 873, 901, 2921, 3076, 3238
Reduction of, M. (Mr. Lanctot) 866, neg. 876
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Military signal service, 3338
Militia
Annual training, 859, 4635
Expenditure and results, 2933
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Payments since 1922, 386
Pensions. *See* Militia Pensions bill; Pensions
Petawawa Camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Services, 859, 1747
Use of in strikes. *See under this title,* Troops
Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See under this title,* Troops
Naval Service, 1744
Consolidation with National Defence and Marine depts., 3341
Curtailment of, 2933

National Defence—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Esquimalt
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634
Stores, 4638
Expenditure, 3076
Naval colleges, Esquimalt and Halifax, 1744
Royal Canadian naval reserve, recruiting, 2897, 2950
Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
War claims, adjustment, 900
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1745
Vickers Company, contract, cancellation, 1746
Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635
Ordnance
Arms, lands, etc. 890
Montreal stores building, 1022
Pay of staff, 890
Peachy, Mr. C., Regina, grant, 4638
Permanent force, 892
Physical training, 877
Royal Canadian regiment, 4638
Schools of instruction, 900
Tecumseh barracks, London, 4638
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627
Valcartier camp grounds, qu. 2298
War claims, adjustment, 1745
Militia services, 900
War medals, 1743
Warlike stores, 900
Wireless stations, 3337
Wolseley barracks, London, 4638

National Fuel Policy. *See* Fuel

National Gallery, 1018, 2688

National Industrial Conference. *See* Labour

National Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Ottawa

National Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Lands and Parks

National Parks and Reservations Bill
(Separation of parks from reservations; administration as recreation grounds; bird and wild animal sanctuaries; historic sites) 1r., 3131

National Policy. *See also* speeches on Budget
Adoption by Liberal party, 2838
Agriculture and, 2786
Anti-national and anti-social, 3018
Budget in accordance with, 2718
Canada's development due to, 2818
Permanency of, 4652
Results, 3060
Rural interests, unjust to, 2786
Special privileges, 2786

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Trust Company, 57
Statement of president on immigration, 1123

National Status. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

National Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, Conservative alliance with, 2924

Nationality. *See* Naturalization
Mental tests according to, 1219

Natural Gas. *See* Natural Resources

Natural Resources, 1880-1, 2836. *See also* Coal; Forests and Forestry; Fuel; Hudson Bay Railway; Immigration; Mines and Minerals; Timber
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Development, 2785
Capital necessary for, 2744, 2802, 3027
Estimate of value, 2719
Valuable only when developed, 2744
Drainage, 3256
Forests, 3416. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Gaspe, 1242
Hoppe leases, 3128. *See also* Hoppe
Interchange with United States, 2910
Maritime provinces, equity of, 2972
Minerals, 3198. *See also* Coal; Mines
Investigation of, 3197
Natural gas, well-drilling machinery, 3487
Ownership and taxation, 2729
Paternalism, 3071
Per capita value, 2714
Regaining of, 2728
Unemployment, 629
Water powers, 3420
Western provinces, 21, 2782, 2972, 3424
Expenditure upon, 2510
Immigration policy and, 1092. *See also* Immigration

Naturalization. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Administration of acts, 2495
Judges and. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Jurisdiction over. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental
Repatriation, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1379, withdrawn, 1382
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Naturalization Acts Amdt. Bill
1r., 1384; 2r., com., 2107; com., 2182; 2437; 3983; 3r., 3985
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for naturalization, 2109
Arbitrary powers, 2456
British system, 2438
Citizenship, obstacles in way of, 2455
Consolidation, 2110, 2182, 2199, 2437
Correspondence, Secretary of State and county court judges, Vancouver, 2199
Denaturalization, 2332, 2451, 2456
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Japan, nationality, 2443
Japanese, 1899
Judges, 2437, 2446, 2451
Application for naturalization, 3983
Investigations, "huge joke," 2446
Judicial and executive authority, 2462
Nationality, dual, amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2442, 2451, 2456, 2463
Natural-born British subject, definition, 2107
Naturalization
Imperial, 2463
Limited, 2461
Politics and, 2438, 2466
Orientals, 2461
Relationship, naturalization law to Immigration Act, 2455
Repeal, 3983
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Administration by, 2437, 2453
Discretion, 2447
Winnipeg Free Press, editorial, 2454

Naval Defence. *See under* National Defence, Naval Service

Naval Protection. *See* Canada's Participation in War

Naval Service. *See* Imperial Conference; National Defence

Navigation. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence

Near East Crisis. *See also* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference
Canada's participation, 12-13, 25, 40, 45, 71, 105, 120-121, 141, 162, 169, 1266, 2815, 4655
Prime Minister, statement, 29-33

Necessaries of Life. *See* Address; Budget; Combines; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices; Tariff; Taxation

Negro Point breakwater, 4587

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 174; the two amendments, 174; economy and free trade, 175-176; policy of moderate protection, 177
Agricultural conditions in West, 1192
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, 3160
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Business of the House, M. to increase taxation, 3937
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 114
Canadian National Railways, agents for labour supply, 1191
Canadian Pacific railway, labour supply, 1191
Certificated masters, coasting vessels, 3971
Cheque tax, 3925, 3931
Amdt. 3935
Payment with postage stamps, 1818
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-36, 4537
Children born in Canada, 2323
Head tax, 2323
Merchants and students, 2323
Fraudulent entry, 2324
Merchants
Definition of, 2483
Retail, attitude towards, 2322
Scope of, 2323
Coal, bituminous, duty, 1278, 3495, 3499
Eight-hour law, conference, qu. 207, qu. 279
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fish and fisheries
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Freight rates, 1953
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Free trade, Progressives and, 1196
Freight rates
Oliver, Hon. John, 1952
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1951
Original motion, effect of, 1953

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Fuel oil, competition with coal, 807
Fuel supply, 807
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4643
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1193
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific agents, 1191
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Labour employers and, 1193
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Chinese, registration certificates, 1452
Exclusion from United States, 1194
Japanese
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1450
Lemieux agreement, 1450
Naturalization, 2442
Registration system, 1452
Supposed special privileges to landholders, 1450
Violation of regulations, 1451
Policy, 1191
Population not increased by, 1195
Propaganda, 1192
Railways and, 1193
"Unseen Hand", the, 1193
Immigration Act Amdt. bills, 3981
Intending immigrants, 74, 497, 4441
Imperial Conference, 4643-49
Income tax, 1195, 4501
Japan, trade with, 1450
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Discontent, 1194
Right to organize, 2896
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4240
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Japanese, 2442
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109, 2442, 2465
Amdt. 2442
Nationality, dual, 2442
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 700
Pacific coast steamship services, 4003
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3860
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
Committees, 288
Powell River Paper Company, 2886, 2896
Promissory notes tax, 3925

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 393
Railway Commission, steamship services and, 4003
Reciprocity with United States, 1196
Renovated butter, 4266
Revenue stamps, 1818
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Seymour Narrows, obstruction to navigation, 3333
Steamship services
Canada-West Indies, 3388
Competition, 3398
Railway Commission, control, 4003
Tax exempt bonds, qu. 342
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291, 4645
Amdt. (Mr. Neill), 1292
Seconder, 1308
Uchucklesit-Ecoole telegraph line, 1017
Unemployment, 1193
Hoboes, 1194
Wheat bounty, 1196

Nelson, B.C.
Board of Trade, Mounted Police, 2943
Ore-testing plant, 2505, 2507

Netherlands, The. *See also* Holland; Immigration
Senate, constitution of, 1372

New Brunswick. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Assignments and Preferences Act, 3087
Bonded warehouses, 1212
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Coal, 804
Dredging, 4951
Employment offices, 1630
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Gas and oil fields, 2949, 3920
Geological survey, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 945
Highways, 3182, 4587. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1086, 1198, 1476
Bowder, Mr., representative, Great Britain, 1086
Indians, 2124, 2153
Kent Northern railway, 4189
Labour scarcity in lumber camps, 1125
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949, 3920
Permanent force, strikes, 1627
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Potatoes, 137-139, 2763

New Brunswick—*Con.*
Public buildings, 4613
Representation, Canadian National board, qu. 282
Shale deposits, 2513
Veniot, Premier, statement, qu. 1488

New Carlisle, Que., wharf, 973

New Ontario. *See* Ontario

New Westminster, liquor sales, 2415

New York
Canadian customs officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272, 3275

New York Tribune, reported statement, Mr. Meighen, on immigration, 2790

New Zealand
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3297
Immigration
British, 2932
Chinese, 2313
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Immigration Act, 497
Policy, 1882
Land settlement policy, 1406
Legislative council, constitution, 1371
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis

Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C.
Opinions
Canada Temperance Act, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' Case, 2521
Visit to United States, 3823

Newfoundland steamship service, 2171, 2173, 3377

News Items, dissemination of. *See* Press

News Service. *See* Press

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper

Niagara and St. Catharines Railway, 2475

Niagara Falls
Michigan Central bridge
Construction contracts, qu. 1864
Remission of sales tax, qu. 1257
Power. *See* Welland canal

Niagara District, Grape-growers, competition, 452. *See* Treaties, French; Wines

Nickle Resolution. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Nickle, shipments to Germany during war 4371

Nicolet
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., election, 2837
Vacancy, 2178

Nicomen Island, protection, 626

Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307

Nitti, Ex-Premier, of Italy, 46, 313

"Noble Eighteen". *See* Reciprocity

Noble Foundation Farm, 2813

Nolin, Mrs. J., St. David postmistress, 1489

Nominative Scheme. *See* Immigration

Nominative Senate. *See* Senate

North Atlantic Trading Company. *See* Immigration

North Atlantic and U.K. Conference. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

North Essex Election. *See* Elections

North Vancouver. *See* Vancouver

Northern Ontario. *See* Ontario

Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection Bill. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
(Close season; use of Canadian ports; seizures; International Fisheries Commission)
Res. 4480; 1r., 2r., com., 4485; 3r., 4489

Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635

Northwest Rebellion. *See* Pensions

Northwest Territories
Administration, 3944, 3948
Indians, 2145
Procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974
Purchase and maintenance of new ship, 4702

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 180; 2r., com., 270; 3r., 271; Senate amdts., 2050

Norway
Immigration from, 1191
Storthing, constitution of, 1372

Notes, Tax. *See* Taxation

Nova Scotia. *See also* Maritime Provinces
British Empire Steel Corporation, employees, 1705,
Coal, 1269, 1273, 1277, 3199. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Coke and, 1268
Freight rates on, 1277, 2828
Production, qu. 490
Resources, 800
Confederation, attitude towards, 1376
Disallowance of statute. *See* Disallowance
Dredging, 4591
Emigration from, 1404
Expenditure, 4555
Experimental farms, 460
Harbours and rivers, 941, 4554, 4560, 4635, 4722. *See also that title*
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
Highways, 3183. *See also that title*
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1086, 1200, 1476
Indians, 2124, 4702
Markets for, 2243
Miners
Strike, 495, 1627, 1716
Troops, use of, qu. 624, 866, 869, 892, 2893
United States delegates, detention, 3155. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Nova Scotia Historical Society, 3406
Ports, used by United States fishermen, 3906
Public buildings, 4612
Redistribution and, 73. *See also that title*
Representation, reduction. *See* Redistribution
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Secession, 2057, 2177
Resolution, 2243
Senate, elective or nominative, 1368-76
Sessional indemnity, reduction in, 1155
Steel bounties, 4371
Steel-workers strike, 1643
Supreme Court, Hon. D. D. McKenzie, appointment, 1810
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Windsor, site of Fort Edward, 3406

Noxious Weeds. *See* Seed Inspection

Nursery Stock. *See also* Horticulture
Insects and pests, 596
Sales tax, 4432

Oaths of Office Bill, 1r., 3

Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

Ocean Freight Rates, 69. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Ocean Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Ports

O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Officials, travels of. *See* Government; Marshall

Ogilvie Milling Company, mill feeds, 2875

O'Halloran, Mr. George F. *See also* Patents Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2346

O'Hara, Captain Marshall. *See* Marine

Ohta, Hon. T. *See* Immigration, Oriental, Jananese

Oil. *See also* Bounties; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Alberta, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Prospecting and development, 780
Revenue from, qu. 2515
Southern, 2508, 3423
British Columbia oil companies, 2505
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, drilling, 2508
Customs drawbacks, 2655
Drilling operations, 2505
Fort Norman, 3423
Fuel oil
Competition with coal, 807, 1245
Importations, 1245
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Standardization, 808
Hudson's Hope, 4699
Imperial Oil Company, 4380
Leases, 3423
Lubricating, standardization, 808
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 3920
Petroleum. *See also that title*
Bounty, 2648, 2510, 3914
Duty, 2653, 2644
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Search for, 2802
Speculation in claims, 3423
Southern Alberta, 2508, 3423
Used in manufacture of manila rope, 3901
Drawback, 3502
Well-drilling machinery, 2653, 3487

Oil Springs, Ont., postmaster, qu. 518

Old Age Annuities. *See* Labour, Annuities

Old Age Pensions. *See* Pensions

Oleomargarine. *See also* Dairying Industry
Agriculture and Colonization Com., discussion in, 3266
Butter and, 386. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada Food Board, 3520
Canada only country prohibiting, 3531
Canadian Lumberman's Association, 3508
Class interests, 3534
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3325, 3449. *See also that title*
Dairying industry and, 3296
Denmark, 3515, 3523
Difference of opinion in government, 3530
Duty, 2777
French treaty, 1984
Great War Veterans' Association, 3547
Health and, 3558
Ingredients, 3562
Labelling, 3152
Local Council of Women, 3513
"Manna," 3152
Manufacture, 3153, 3553
Manufacture, importation and sale
Further legislation, inquiry, 230, 1309, 2519, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3508; agreed to as amended, 3581
Amdt. (Mr. Kay), reversion to status quo ante, 3520, agreed to, 3580
Point of order, amdt. direct neg, 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) govt. to submit legislation before end of session, 3567; neg., 3581
Point of order, 3571
Opportunity for discussion, 3510, 3519
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3326
Precedence of, 3451
Materials for, imports, duty and drawback, 3503, qu. 3505
National Dairy Council, 3269, 3509
Order in council suspending prohibition, 3520, 3525, 3526
Pledge to dairymen, 3525, 3531
Propaganda, 3266, 3402
Protection, 3534, 3546
Regulations, 3517
Restaurants, sale in, 3517
Restrictions, 3517
Retail Merchants' Association, 3508, 3551
Substitute, 3522
Victoria Board of Trade, telegram, 3513
War measure, 3520, 3525
Western farmers and, 1423
Women, 3508

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Oliver, Hon. John
Freight rates, 1915, 1952
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383

Olivier, Hon. Mr., Senate, elective or nominative, 1367

Olympic Games, Canadian team, 4706

One-Sixth Vote. *See* Supply, Interim Supply

Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 2765
Attorney General
Betting information, 1483
Combines, 2585
Wholesale Grocers case, decision, 2051 2521
Bootlegging, 2410
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Coal, reported discovery, 2512
Court of Appeal, decision, 2051, 2521
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Drury government, expenditure and debt 2824
Experimental farms, 459
Farm labour, scarcity, 1416
Farmers and protection, 2818
Farmers' government and immigration, 1420
Government house, 4628
Government savings offices, qu. 1488
Interest rate, 1697
Grain elevators, 2037, 4716, 4719
Harbours and rivers, 981, 4588, 4594
Highways, 3177. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Expenditure, 2489
Home markets, 2818
Hydro-electric development, 426, 3056. *See also* Hydro
Hydro Power Commission, 1270
Immigration, 1085, 1096-8, 1320, 1428, 1475, 1476. *See also that title*
Child, and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Indians, 2124, 2146
Lake of the Woods. *See that title*
Legal, fees, expenditure, 1155
New Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 1401
French-Canadian settlement, 1401
Market for agricultural products, 1402
Northern Ontario
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Conditions and possibilities, 3037
Immigration into, 1097, 1112, 1320
Indians, 2151
Opportunities for settlers, 1097

Ontario—*Con.*
Oil bounty, 2510
Ontario elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4005, 4162
Ontario Factory Act, printing bureau, 1763
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public ownership, 3056
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Radial railways, 3056
Raney, Hon. W. E., Attorney General
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Race-track betting, 712
Letter from, to Mr. Good, 2181
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, qu. 1255
See also Post Office
Soldier settlement, qu. 492
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, 1071, 3056
United Farmers, co-operative stores, 4068
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

"Opium Joint". *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Opposition. *See* Conservative Party; Meighen

Orders in Council
Canadian National Railways, 815
Civil Service Commission
June 29th, 1922, qu. 278
September 22nd, 1922, 380-1
Depreciated currency, 2988
Duties against United States, reduction by, 2649, 2650
Exemptions by, 359
Expenditure by, 949, 950
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354
Marking of goods, 2988
Lead pencils, 2988
Lithographic works, 2988
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4487
Number passed, 1921 and 1922, qu. 1488
Numbers
P. C. 220, unemployment, 435
P. C. 223, 815
P. C. 1053, qu. 516
P.C. 1566, 249
Oleomargarine, suspending prohibition of, 3520, 3525, 3526
Peace treaty, under, 767
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4349, 4393
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474, 3479
Repeal of by statute, 3504
Tariff reduction under, 3049
Wheat Board, 3046
Legislation extended, 3045

Ordnance Lands. *See* Interior

Ore-Testing. *See* Mines and Minerals

Orient, Trade with. *See* Trade; Vancouver Harbour Bill

Oriental Immigration. *See* Immigration

Orientals. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration; Labour; Narcotic Drugs Act; Naturalization
British Columbia in, 1541, 1893-1903
Deportation. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Fishing licenses, reduction, 1548
Naturalization of, 2442. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Orillia, Champlain monument, 4705

Orthopedic Boots. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Ostrea Lake, N.S. wharf, 943

Ottawa
Canadian Press, Limited, 2523
Chateau Laurier, deficit, 2976
Daly building, purchase, 1023
Dominion Archives building, addition, 1730
Dominion observatory, 3242
Government workshops, 4616
National Gallery, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020 2685
New departmental building, 1729, 4617
Architects, compensation, 4633
Newspaper combine, 2522, 2630
Ore-testing plant, 2505
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015, 4590
Parliament buildings, 1716
Printing bureau, 1022. *See also that title*
Too much government from, 3434

Ottawa Dairy Company, 2526, 2569

Ottawa Free Press Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085

Ottawa Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa River
Water powers, qu. 1974
Point Fortune, qu. 1974
Water storage, 815

Ottawa Typographical Union, copyrights, 2144

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Overseas Settlement Board. *See* Immigration

Owen, Admiral Sir W. F. W., St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

Owen Sound Wharf, 2690

Oxford Paper Company, Rumford, Maine, 835-6

Pacaud, Mr. L. T.
Appointment, 2710
International Labour Conference, 1539, 1647
Pacific Cable Board, representative, 1832

Pacific Cable Board, 1832

Pacific Coast Trade. *See* British Preference; Customs Tariff; Trade

Pacific Fisheries. *See* Japanese; Treaties, Halibut

Pacific Ocean ports. *See* Vancouver Harbour

Pacific Salvage Company, payments, qu. 1763

Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1832

Paints, 2739. *See also* Customs Tariff Items

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Panama Canal. *See also* New York, Customs Officer
Canadian customs regulations, 2519, 2615
Canned salmon via, 2615
Duty on goods passing between Canadian ports, 2519, 2615
Grain shipments, 77, 1921. *See also* Grain
Imports through to British Columbia, 1921
Rail and water competition, 1920
Trade from western to eastern Canada, 2868
Trade, Great Britain to Pacific ports, 3053

Pan-American Union, 496

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment. *See* House of Commons

Paper. *See* Press; Prices; Pulp and Paper

Paper Control. *See* Pulp and Paper

Paper Makers. *See* Powell River Company

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Estimates, time of presentation, 4555
Public expenditure, 4554

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Arctic expedition, 4012
Arctic islands and northern Quebec, 814
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Canadian Pacific railway, Quebec terminals, 815
Cold storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868
Ottawa river, water storage, 815
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Quebec Harbour Commission, cold storage, 2055
Raisins, imports, qu. 2699

Pari-Mutuel System. *See* Race Track Betting

Paris Agency, expenses, 4001

Paris Offices. *See* Canadian National Railways

Park-Davis Company, Metagen, qu. 1867

Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands and Parks; Interior

Parliament
Farmers in, 2732. *See also* Progressive Party
Function of, statement of Edmund Burke, 3018
Opening of, 1
Prorogation, 4755

Parliament Buildings, 1716
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Baker, the late Col. G. H., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Central column at entrance, memorial, 2685
Committee, 1718
Common meeting room, 1727
Commons chamber
Accoustics, 1721. *See also* House of Commons
Lighting, 1728
Members' galleries, 1729
Estimates, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) to reduce, 1727, neg. 1728
Expenditure
To complete, 1716
To date, 1718
Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Marchand, Mr., architect, commission, 1718
Members' rooms
Allocation of, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Ventilation, 1728
Old walls, destruction of, 1723-24
Pearson, Mr. John A., architect, 1716
Policing, 778
Tower, 1722
Chimes, 1722
Completion of, 1719

Parliamentary Documents. *See* Government Publications

Parliamentary Library. *See* Library

Parliamentary Practice, amending of. *See* Lack of Confidence, M.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Responsibility. *See* Canadian National Railways, Branch Lines, Management Lack of Confidence

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee, 53, 382

Parole System. *See* Justice

Participation in War. *See* Canada; Near East Crisis

Partisanship. *See* Political Partisanship

Party Funds, members and, 4237

Party System of Government, 1235, 1254

Passamaquoddy Bay, harbour, 2899, 2938

Passports
Immigrants, 1170
Passport office, 4707
Requirements as to, 3988

Pasteur, Louis, scientific contributions, 1287

Patent Medicines. *See* Health

Patents. *See also* Patent Act Amdt. bill
Revocation of, 2528
Under Combines Act, 2522

Patents and Copyright Branch. *See* Trade and Commerce

Patents of Invention Bill. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs Bill
(To amend and consolidate acts)
1r., 331; 2r., 2064; com., 2064, 2086; 2128; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts., 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, 2129
Exchequer court, 2079
Application for patents, 2067
Conflicting
To be decided by Exchequer court, 2079
To be submitted to arbitration, 2129
Joint, assignments, 2057, 2104, 2130
Particulars required, 2073
Withdrawal of, 2079

Patents of Invention Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Assignments, refusal to execute, 2069
Berne convention, 2064
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2064, 2104, 2128
Conditions, 2089, 2104
Definition, 2064
Domicile, election of, 2070
Food or medicines, 2078
Foreign patents, 2068
Form of issue, 2082
Government use of patented inventions, 2100
Improvements, patenting of, 2069
Inspection by the public, 2101
Issue of new or amended patents, 2082
Models and specimens, 2076
Oath of inventor, 2069
Patent agent or attorney, 2102
Patent office, 2064
Patents for inventions by persons in Public Service, 2082, 2104
Patents to be assignable, 2083, 2086
Register of attorneys, 2101
Repeal, 2102
Restoration and revival of patent, 2100
Revocation of patent, time limit, 2099
Right of appeal, 2100
Special methods or processes of manufacture, 2076
Specifications, drawings, etc., 2073
Suit pending, 2102
Tariff of fees, 2100
Term limit, 2082
What patents shall contain, etc., 2082

Paternalism, excess of, 1133. *See also* Legislation

Patronage. *See* Civil Service; Political Patronage

Patterson, Hon. J. C., investigator of titles, 3360

Peace Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations

Peace River District
German settlers, 1184
Immigration literature, 1433
Railways, 4324
Construction, 1433, 1440, 3006
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Prince George railway, 1434, 4701
Survey, 4698
Settlement in, 1184
Soldier settlers, 1185

Peace Treaty. *See* Germany, Reparations; Treaties

Pearson, Mr. John A., architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Peat. *See* Fuel Supply

Pecuniary Claims Convention, with United States, 779

Peel, Sir Robert, Corn Laws
Abolition of 3050
Reversal of policy on, 3007

Pelee Island steamship service, 2174

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Belanger, Mr. A. C., 1489
Boulay, Mlle, postmistress, Sayabec, 3751, 3759
Matane harbour improvements, 971
Printing committee, fourth report, 4510

Penitentiaries. *See* Justice

Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463

Penny Bank of Toronto Act Amdt. Bill
(Change of name)
1r., 1739; 2r., com., 3r., 2052

Pension Act Amdt. Bill
(Cases subject to review; district appeal boards; federal appeal boards)
Res. 3401, 3748; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3848; 3r., 3887; Senate amdts. 4744
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals to district review board, 3875
Recommendations final, amdt. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 3875, neg. 3881
Time for, 3881
Extension from 3 months to one year, amdt. (Mr. Logan) agreed to, 3881
To be decided under Pension Act, amdt. (Mr. Marler) 3881, neg. 3882
British expeditionary force, members, 3873
Date of coming into force, 3873
Death within five years, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Clark) 3884, agreed to, 3885
Disability
Attributable to military service, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Extent of, how estimated, 3873
In respect of which pensions claimed, 3848
Pensions according to, 3873
Pre-enlistment, 3849
Time of appearance, 3872

Pension Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
District review boards, 3874
Staff or ex-staff officer not eligible, amdt. (Mr. Black), Yukon) 3875, neg. 3875
Federal appeal board, 3875
Insurance principle, 3851
Payment of expenses, 3881
Pension payable to descendants, amdt (Mr. Manion) agreed to, 3886
Review of pension legislation, 3851
When no deduction of pension, 3873
Widow, 4745
Bigamous marriage, 3732, 3886
Who marries after disability appears amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 3882, agreed to 3884
Widowed mother, 3870
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. (Mr. LeSueur) 3870, agreed to, 3871

Pensions. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Judges; Militia Pension Act; Ministers' Salaries and Members' Indemnities; Pensions Act Amdt. Bill
Appeals
Appeal boards, 77, 3875
Dominion Veterans Alliance, com. 3860
Federal, 4703
Attributability, 3850
British expeditionary force, members, 3873, 3885
Committee, re-appointment, inquiry, 288
Commutation of, qu. 4132. *See under this title,* European War
Decrease in amount, 23
Disability entitling to, 677
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166, 3706, 3707
Estimates, suggested postponement, 2166
Expenditure, 2987
Fenian raid, 3742, 3873
Great War Veterans' Association, 2167, 4535
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway employees, 3195
Judges, qu. 492
McDougall, Mrs. William, 3949
Malone, late Lieut.-Col. qu. 206
Medical examination of prisoners, 670
Militia. *See* Militia Pension Act. Amdt bills
Mothers, 2827
Conference with provincial governments, 3046
Northwest rebellion, 3742

Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1646, 2817, 2827, 3032. *See also* Labour, Annuities
Conference with provincial government, 3046
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Inquiry as to legislation, 733, qu. 2517, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res., 1652
Pension Act. *See also* Pension Act Amdt.
Administration of, 3706
Suggested amendments, 2166
Pension Commissioners, board of
Appeal from, 677
Charges against, 685
Estimates, 2166
Interpretation of Pension Act, 2639, 2943
North Essex election and, 670, 708, 2014
Report, 516, 4736
Res., Victoria, B.C., for removal, 3399
Salaries and contingencies, 2168, 3742
Pension legislation, review of, 3851
Petition from veteran organizations, 4535-36
Pilots, 3359
Ralston report. *See under this title,* Royal Commission
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Royal commission
Expenses, 691
Recommendations of, 2394, 2942, 3733
Legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 3400. *See also* Pensions Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill
Inquiry as to, 2639, 2983
Opportunity to discuss, 674, 2394
Reports
First interim report, 2166, 2926, 2983
Final, inquiry, 2516
Printing, qu. 207, 288, 1631, 3401
M. for 1992, 2128
Senators, 1376
South African War, 3873
Tuberculous patients, 3850
Unemployed relief, expenditure, 2168
Women, 1651
Widows, 681

Perfumery. *See* Treaties, French

Peribonka, Que., wharf, 973

Periodicals. *See* Magazines and Periodicals;

Permanency. *See* Reciprocity; Tariff

Permanent Force. *See* National Defence

Peru, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Petawawa Camp, Ontario elections and, 3976, 4005, 4162

Peterborough, weights and measures inspection, qu. 492, 810

Petition of Right Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Coal Leases)
(Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud)
1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3127; 3r., 3130
Sections and subjects discussed:
Fiats, issue and publication of, 3222, 3224
Hoppe leases, 3127
Isenberg estate, 3128
Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud, 3127

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Administration of act, 780
Bounty, 2510, 2648, 2949, 3914, 3963
Duty, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3963
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949
Production and payment, qu. 3262

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act Amdt. Bills
1. Regulations governing sale of naphtha
Res. 3749; order discharged, 3969
2. Sale of naphtha
1r., 4248; 2r., 4249; com., 4276; 3r., 4276

Petroleum Bounty Act Amdt. Bill
(Reduction and discontinuance of bounty)
Res. 2657, 3914, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Pharmaceutical Preparations. *See* Health

Physical Training. *See* National Defence, Cadet Services,

Piche Point, Que. wharf, 973

Pictou, N.S., dredging, 4584. *See also* Harbours and Rivers

Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish steamship service, 2174

Pictou-Souris-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 2174

Pictures. *See* National Gallery

Pierreville, Que., postmaster, qu. 4511

Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Pineapples, production in Fiji Islands, 1848

Pioneer, the, recognition of, 1394, 2870

Piracy. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Pitt, William, reciprocity treaty, France, 3050

Plains of Abraham, Battle of, soldiers who became farmers, 1188

Plaster Quarries. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute

Playgrounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites

Plebiscites. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Pocket Boroughs. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Pointe à Elie, Que. wharf, 974

Point au Pic, Murray Bay, wharf, 973

Pointe aux Trembles, Que. wharf, 974

Pointe Shea (Amherst) pier, 977

Poland
Immigration, 1204
Treatment of Ukrainians. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Political Offenders, imprisonment, 3157

Political Parties. *See also* Conservative; Liberal; Progressive
Big interests, contributions, 2856, 3070
Capital and, 2810
Liberal and Conservative, 2793, 2812

Political Partisanship. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Costly, 2787
Dismissals for, 3344

Political Patronage. *See also* Civil Service; National Policy
Alberta, 522
Appointments, 2710. *See also* Post Office
Boulay, Mlle, dismissal of, 3706, 3750
Canadian National Railways, 134-135
Charlotte county, N.B., 945
Civil Service, 519
Indians, medical service, doctors, 2160
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3303. *See also that title*
Patronage list, 946
Political supporters, jobs for, 2710
Post offices, 3316. *See also* Post office
Sorel shipyard, 3344, 3374

Political Policies. *See also* speeches on Budget; Conservative Party; Liberal Party; National Policy; Progressive Party; Reciprocity
Appropriation of, 2781
Big interests and, 2856, 3070
"Doubtful virtue of consistency," 3056
Economic group organization, 3003
Graft, big interests and old parties, 2855
Liberal and Conservative, 2812
Platforms
Repudiation of, 2973, 2994
Value of, statement, Mr. Euler, 2852, 2974, 2991
Proposed, Hon. Mr. Tolmie, 2870
Reversal of, 3007
Two parties but one policy, 2793

Pollution of Boundary Waters. *See* Health

Pollution of Rivers. *See* Marine

Pool Rooms. *See* Race Track Betting

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Pope, Sir Joseph. *See* External Affairs

Population. *See also* Budget; Emigration; Immigration
Birth rate, 1197
Death rate, 1197
Distribution of, 2747
Immigration
Natural increase and, 1871-1921, 1207
Not increased by, 1195
Increase, 1398, 2819
Net, 1173
Loss of, 119, 1439, 3018. *See also* Emigration
Ratio of public employees to, 3027
Representation by. *See* Proportional Representation
Tax burden upon, 3001. *See also* Taxation
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Pork Products. *See* Bacon; Meats

Port Arthur
Grain shipments, 1114. *See also* Grain
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, 3354

Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012

Port Colborne elevator, 4690. *See also* Grain

Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, monument, 3433

Port Elgin breakwater, 2690

Port Greville, N.S. breakwater, 944

Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or Lakes steamship services, 2174

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Port Renfrew, B.C. wharf, 1008

Portage la Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 993, 998, 3041
District board, resolution, 3039
Indians medical service, doctors, 2160
Sewerage outlet, 993, 2679

Portage River, N.S. breakwater, 950

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Vancouver harbour bill, 269

Portland, Maine. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Terminals
Grain shipments via, qu. 1484

Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Imports and Exports; Shipping, *and also* their individual titles
Canadian, 2898. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
British preference and, 140, 2948, 3053, 3454. *See also* British Preference; Budget
Direct importation by, 3454, 3895
Discrimination against, 2960
Loading of grain cargoes at, 3974
Shipments via, 4714
Use of. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut treaty
United States fishermen, by, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Montreal. *See that title*
Ocean ports, 2937. *See also* Halifax; St. John
Comparative mileages, 2939
Passamaquoddy bay, 2938
St. Croix, 2899, 2938
Shippigan, 2938
Comparative mileage, 2939
Pacific, trade through Panama canal, 3053
Quebec. *See that title*
United States, grain shipments through, 3764
Vancouver. *See that title*
Wardens. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Portugal, Upper Chamber, constitution, 1372

Postal Conference. *See* Post Office

Postage Stamps. *See* Post Office

Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1314-15, 1538, 1816, 1821, 3067

Post Office
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
British mails, delay in, 2639, 2694, 2695
Canadian federation of postal employees, salaries, 1794
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Department
Acting Minister, 2710
Annuities branch, 1640-42
Transfer to Labour dept., 1639
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Coolican, Mr. P. T., General Superintendent of Postal Service, 1816
Deputy Postmaster General
Appointment of, 1805, 2710
Coulter, Dr. R. M.
Retirement, 1822, 1825
Service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135
Estimates, 1778, 1814
Proceedings in minister's absence, 1314
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Purchasing Commission and, 4001
Revenue
Gross, 1818, 1825
Not connected with postal service, 1815
Salaries and contingencies, 1793-4, 1814
Staff, 1824
Superintendeent of mail services, 1814
Superintendent of postal services, Mr. George Ross, retirement, 1825
Supplies, purchase of, 3951
Surplus claimed, 1817
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Dismissals and appointments. *See under this title,* Postmasters
International Postal Conference, 4529
Letter carriers
Bonus to, 1784
Salaries, 1780
Mail contracts. *See also under this title,* Rural Mail
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868, 1977
Sporting Mountain, N.S., qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, qu. 4302
Mail service, 1778
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions. *See* Steamship Services
Ocean mail, pilot boats and, 3359
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Patronage, 1794. *See also under this title,* Postmasters

Post Office—*Con.*
Postage rates
Letter rate
United States and Canada, comparison, 2745
War tax, 2744, 2858
Newspapers and periodicals, 4436, 4528
Public libraries, 1809
Reduction of, 1779, 2824, 2945
Special delivery, 1872, 2933
Postage stamps
Commission on sale of, 1819
Payment of excise taxes with, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3937, 4435
Sale of, 2979
Selling cost, 1818
Postal contracts. *See under this title,* Mail, Rural Mail
Postal service
Quebec district, extra service compensation, 1832
Postal Treaty with United States, 2, 4529
Postmasters
Agents for annuities, 1641-42
Appointments and dismissals, 1809, 1827, 4534
Appointments
List of, 1830
Members' recommendations, 1799-1829
Political patronage, 3316
Returned soldiers, 1799
Dismissals, 4534
Angouleme, Quebec, qu. 3139
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boucher, Mrs., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, Sayabec, 3706, 3750
Brussels, 1800
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, qu. 2698
Herbertville, qu. 3139
Labarre, Que. dismissals, qu. 3138
Larouche, qu. 3137
Levis county, qu. 519
Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Midland, qu. 623
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
North Oakville, 914
Oil Springs, Ont., qu. 518
Portsmouth, Ont., 1832
Rawding, Mr., dismissal, 1795
Renfrew, qu. 205
St. Barnabe Nord, Que., 1830
St. Bruno, Que. qu. 3140
Ste. Claire, Que., qu. 1031

Post Office—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
Dismissals—*Con.*
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140
St. Peters', N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D.W., qu. 1488
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, Que., qu. 3139
Wingham, 1800
Woodbridge, 1821
Commission on stamp sales, 1818
Patronage, 3316
Residence, 1796
Post office money orders, tax, 3923
Post Offices
Grade Three, qu. 4300
Montreal. *See also that title*
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Number of post offices, qu. 3135
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Promotions, qu. 2298
Saskatoon post office, 1785
Toronto
Postal station "A," 4624
Post office building, 3277
Revenue, 1779
Radio equipment, 1780
Railway mail service, 1783, 4529
Payments to Canadian Pacific, qu. 3143
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1821
Carriers
Compensation for loss, 1832
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim, 1832
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Remuneration, 1780, 1822, 3070, 3076
Ontario, average, qu. 1259
Contracts, 1781
Extension of, 1802
Improvement of, 1780, 2830
Spur lines, 1826
Western provinces, 1441, 1790, 1801
War loan dividends, delivery of, 1804
Winnipeg postal employees, salaries, 4672

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
(Rates on newspapers and periodicals)
1r., 4436; 2r., com., 4528; 3r., 4535

Potatoes. *See this title under* Vegetables

Potlatch. *See* Indians

Potter, Mr. Howard G., Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795

Poultry. *See also* Eggs
French treaty, 1983
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 3071
M. (Mr. Neill) to adjourn House, 2886; withdrawn, 2897

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 861, 872
Canada's participation in war, M., 1529
Civil Service Act, M. for repeal, 345, 371, 519, 520, 568
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4346, 4348, 4395
Amdt. six months' hoist, 4396, neg. 4397
Forests, preservation of, 4349
Grondines wharf, 965
Labour troubles, use of troops, 861, 893
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3998
Withdrawal, M., 1529, 3999
Military expenditure, 873
National Defence, pay of staff, 890
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-87
Pension commissioners, removal, 685
Pensions, commutation of, 3725
Permanent force, 892
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4346, 4348, 4395
Quebec riots, 893
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 712
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3744
Saar valley, administration of, 4000
Soldiers 'Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Vocational loans and training, 688

Power Development. *See* Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers

Prairie Provinces. *See* Alberta; Manitoba; Saskatchewan; Western Provinces

Pre-Cooling Plants. *See* Cold Storage

Pre-emptions, sale of. *See* Lands

Preferential Tariff. *See* British Preference; Reciprocity; Treaties, French, Italian

Press
British and foreign news service, 4712
Canadian Press Limited, 1464, 2555, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727

Press—*Con.*
Canadian Press Limited—*Con.*
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Ottawa franchise, 4730
Payments to, qu. 3703
President, 2630
Subsidy, 2631, 4535, 4728
Control, 3074
Capitalistic, 2726
Fisheries publicity, 3364
Gambling in staples, justification of, 3059
Hearst syndicate, 828
Magazines and periodicals, Canadian, encouragement, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Newspapers
Alleged combine, 2522, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630, 4728
Postage rates on, 4436, 4528
Printing contracts with government, 2298, 2394, 2614
Quotations from. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Registration of ownership, 615
Size of, 4534
Statement as to treaties, 245
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2979. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Publishing business, difficulties of, 4415
Reuter's news service, 4712
Subsidy to, 2631
Windsor Telegram, Canadian Press and, 2630

Preston, Mr. R. F. (Lanark)
Introduced, 3

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., qu. 206, 247, 1362. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4312
Grande Freniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312
Laurentians, the, 4312
Quebec highways, qu. 814
Railway commissioners, qu. 1260

Price Waterhouse & Company, report, 2954

Prices. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Customs Tariff Items; Finance; Immigration; Markets; Taxation; Trade
Agricultural products, 2731, 2835, 2862, 3068-9
Higher south of boundary, 2715
Manufactured products and, 1403, 1407, 1851, 1853, 1885, 1907, 2747, 2787, 2873, 2928 3018, 3024
Past and present, 2978

Prices—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2836, 2991, 3070
Comparative, 1407
Babson, Mr. Roger, report, 1084
Bacon, 2933
Banks and, 4047
Binder twine, 4377
Building materials, 2164, 3004
Butter, 2821, 3513, 3533. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada and United States, 2801, 3025
Comparison of, 2738, 2742, 2836, 2916, 3025
Canadian Pacific railway lands, 3704
Cattle, 2871
Cheese, 3295
Coal, 1812, 2824, 3198. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Combines and, Jenks, Professor, 2600
Combines in restraint of trade. *See* Combines bill
Commodity, 1167
Agricultural and, 1083
Consumer. *See also that title.*
Producer, and, 1813, 2727, 2829
Control of, 2812, 4226
Cost, 1851
Cotton goods, 3463
Credit inflation and, 4226
Dairy supplies, 2740
Denims, drills, ginghams, 2738
Electric energy, 3784
Farm products. *See under this title,* Agricultural
Fencing and poultry netting, 2740
Fixing, 2520, 2606, 2786
Food, 2584, 2824, 2933
Clothing and, 2873
Freight rates and, 1958. *See also that title*
Furnaces, warm air, 2739
Gasoline engines, 2740
Harness, 2739
High, 2583, 2737, 2748, 2812
Hogs, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Increase, 2713
By taxation, 2716
Since 1912, 1408
Indians, charged to, qu. 3142
Inflation and deflation, 64, 647, 2800, 3024, 4226
Interest rate and, 4166
Live Stock. *See also that title*
Producer and consumer, 2877
Lumber, 2875, 3036
Manufactured goods, 2823, 2836, 2972, 3018, 3029, 3068
Higher, north of boundary, 2715
Middleman and, 1230, 2972

Prices—*Con.*
Milk, 2569, 2591
Monopolies and, 2521
Nails, 2740
Oleomargarine, 3513
Paints, 2739
Paper, 829, 2888
Potatoes, 2820
Price level, inequality of, 629
Producer and consumer, 1853, 2727, 2829
Pulpwood, 3036, 3417, 4345. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Railway ties, 3036
Re-sale, fixing of, 2525, 2546
Rubber boots, 2740
Safety razors, 2740
Sewing machines, 2739
Silks, 2397-2400
Spread
Producer and consumer, 1852, 2713, 3029
Wholesale and retail, 1230
Stabilization of, 4069, 4666
Sugar, 2646, 2888, 2933, 3069
Gambling in, 3058
Tools, 2740
United States. *See under this title,* Canada and United States
Washing machines, 2740
Wheat, 628, 3004. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Wheat Board, 2857
Woollen goods, 2990, 3459

Prime Ministers' Conference. *See also* Imperial Conference
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Prince Albert stockyards, 2779

Prince Edward Island. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Agricultural conditions, 2763, 2972
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Emigration from, 1404
Experimental farms, 460
Fox industry, 2763
Harbours and rivers, 945, 4586
Highways, 3184. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration and, 1200
Land settlement policy, 1406
Potato-growing, 131, 2763
Public buildings, 4614
Railway employees' pensions, 3195
Railway facilities, 128
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682

Prince George-Peace River projected railway, 1434, 4701

Prince Rupert, 110, 115
Civic employees union, 2086
Development of port, 261, 2734
Dry dock, qu. 1664
Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company
Creditors, 4708
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 1138
Fishing industry, 2734

Printing. *See also* Government Publications; Printing Bureau
Combines, 1623
Contracts, 1974
Newspaper and printing companies, 2298, 2394, 2614
Copyright, 2140. *See also* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Government publications, 3266
Government, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Immigration publications, 1873
Interior dept. reports, 3443
King's Printer, audit of outside accounts, 1623
Parliamentary and departmental publications, 811
Postage stamps, 1818
Presses
Duty, 2653, 2858, 3486
French treaty, 1981
Railway department, 3197

Printing Bureau. *See also* Editorial Committee; Labour
Boilers, condition of, 1736-38
Canada Gazette, 1708
Depreciation, 1711
Draper, Mr. P. M., Director of Printing, 1668
Employees, 1623
Grievances, opportunity to present, 1654
Retiring allowances, former, 3949
Fire hazard, 1736
Govt. publications, distribution, 1712
Immigration publications, 1873
Improvements, 1022
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, appointment, 1668
Labour Gazette, 1621, 1712
Miscellaneous printing, 1716
New building, 1712, 1730
M. (Mr. Beland) to reduce 1730, agreed to, 1737
Ontario Factory Act, 1736
Outside printing, cost of, qu. 3131

Printing Bureau—*Con.*
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Post Office department, 1818, 1820
Publications and documents, distribution, 1712
Purchasing Commission, 1674
Reorganization, 1731, 1735
Stationery, embossed, 1716

Printing, Joint Committee, 53, 202
Reports
First, 1156, 1361
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4436, 4510

Prison Reform. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Agricultural conditions, 1842
Binder twine, price of, 4380
Budget, 2730. Speeches in Parliament; divergence of views as to policy; condition of agriculture; failure of fiscal policy; unemployment; wages and prices, 2730; farmer, unsatisfactory condition of; farm labour; markets; agricultural products, price of; the tariff; natural resources; agricultural production; national debt, 2731; burden upon the farmer; education, cost of; immigration policy; contrast between treatment of native-born and immigrant; farmers in Parliament, 2732; financial influence and class rule in politics; economy, 2733;
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4544
Hemp bounty bill, 4380
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743, 751
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Vocational loans, 689
Vocational training, 689

Pritchard, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Private Betting. *See* Race Track Betting

Private Bills, Committee
Reports, 936, 2204, 2417, 3323, 3887, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

Private Bills Discussed
Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company, 1834
Canadian Press Limited, 1464
Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, 2281
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Woodmen of the World, 3982

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeal from Railway Commission, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Combines, decisions. *See* Combines Bill

Producers' Dairy Company, Vancouver, 2526

Producers' Dairy Company, Ottawa, 2569

Production. *See also* Agriculture; Industries; Manufacturers; Textiles
Annual, statement of, 2720
Costs, 640, 2748, 2815, 2835, 2836. *See also* Labour; Manufacturers
Lower, 2748
Public debt, 640
Exceeding demand, 2957
Implements of, control, 2722
"Produce more, consume less," 4054
Production for use, 2727
Want and, 4053

Professional Men, charges and standard of living, 2813

Profiteering, 2578. *See also* Combines Bill

Progressive Party. *See also* Address; Budget; Forke; Immigration
Alberta, 2799, 2810
Attitude, extreme, 3065
Budget amendments
Forke, Mr., 2717-18, 2809
Opportunity to move, 2711
Constitution and policy, 2791, 2793
Criticism of, 3070
Crowsnest pass agreement and, 2971
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
"Concession forced by Progressives," explanation, Mr. Forke, 2971
Demands, alleged selfish, 3030
Economic, not political, group, 1863, 3003
Expenditures suggested, 3076
Farmers in Parliament, 2732, 2787
Farmers' movement, 2884
Free trade and, 1196, 2818, 3024, 3030
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1666, 1687
Hammell, Mr., 2884
Immigration policy, 1413. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Attitude of some Progressive members on, 2774
Leader of. *See also* Forke
Campaign of 1921, 1853
New, references to, 11, 17, 27
Liberal platform of 1919, opposition, 2925
Manitoba, 2799, 2810
Organization, 2815

Progressive Party—*Con.*
Platform, 2845
Tariff, 2777
Policy and action, 2935
For Western provinces only, 2817
Predicament, of, 2814
Proportional representation, 424
Right to move amendment, 1299-1307
"Stronger and more menacing enemy," 2976
Speeches, pessimistic, 2936
Tariff and, 1421, 2737, 2745
Concessions to, 2743
Reduction of, 3024
Taxation, 2837
Union government and big interests, 1853
Withdrawals from, 2976

Prohibited Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill; Liquor; Race Track Betting
British Columbia Association, control of liquor, 2409
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Plebiscite, cost of, 2495

Promissory Notes. *See* Taxation

Promotions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Proof, Onus of. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Proportional Representation, 171
Alternative vote in single member constituencies, 388, agreed to, 389
Effect on public ownership, 426
Multi-member constituencies, M. (Mr. Good) 389, neg. on div. 434
Single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Proprietary Medicines. *See* Health

Prorogation, 4736, 4755
Probable date of, 2166

Prosecutions. *See* Combines Bill

Protection. *See also* Bounties; speeches on Budget; Industries
Adequate, 2957
Agricultural depression and, 1837-64
Agricultural implement industries, 2975
Applications for, 3235
Basis of government policy, 2718
Budget and, 3077
Case for to be heard publicly, 2718, 3016
Class privilege, 3069

Protection—*Con.*
Conditions
Comparison before and after adoption, 2819
Solution for, 3013
"Dismal failure," 3018
Double standard of buying and selling, 2872
"Economically and fundamentally wrong," 2973
Free trade and, 2806, 2922. *See also that title*
Granted without investigation, 3492
Great Britain, 2752. *See also that title*
"Illogical absurdities of," 3014
Inequity of, 2792
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid on, 2872
"Legalized robbery," 3071
Minister of the Interior and, 2805
Money and moral cost of, 3070
Oleomargarine, 3534, 3546
Ontario, 2852, 2856
Political contributions, 3071
Principle of, 2792
Intact, 2990
Unsound, 2718, 2836
Protected industries and, 2957
"Protectionist budget," 3068, 3077
Quebec, 2852
Rigid adherence to by government, 2988
Sugar refiners, 2987
Suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Tariff stability, 2648
United States and, 2751
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Wheat Board, 3235
Woollen industry, 3458

Providence, R.I. *See* Canadian National Railways; Terminals

Provinces, federal representation. *See* Redistribution

Provincial Governments. *See also* Immigration
Conferences on source of revenue, 65
Extravagance, 2797
Senators, nomination of, 1377

Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* British North America Act; Disallowance; Jurisdiction

Provincial Legislation. *See* Legislation

Provincial Rights. *See also* Disallowance; Jurisdiction; Legislation
Anglo-Japanese treaty, restriction of, 1453
Bankruptcy, 3097
Senate and, 1377
Water Powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Public Accounts. *See* Board of Audit Bill

Public Archives, 3985
Building, addition to, 1730
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, Dominion Archivist, salary, 4673

Public Buildings. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 1023
Calgary post office, 1024
Armouries, fittings and alterations, 1024
British Columbia
Bamfield, 1024
Victoria, old post office, 1024
Charlottetown, 4614
Coal purchases, 496
Economy in. *See* Printing Bureau
Experimental farms, 4629
Generally, 1025
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Improvements, repairs, 1024
Installation of fuel-saving devices, 4629
Manitoba, 4628
Brandon, 4628
Emerson, 4628
Winnipeg, 4628
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal, qu. 4512
Maritime provinces generally, 1022, 4614
Military hospitals, 4629
Montreal ordnance stores, 1022
Moose Jaw, 1023
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario
Haileybury, 4615
Hamilton, 4628
Ottawa government workshops, 4616
Rideau hall, 4627
Royal Military college, 4628
Toronto, 4624
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621
Ottawa, 1716
Daly building purchase, 1023
Departmental buildings, 1729, 4617
Compensation to architects, 4633
M. (Mr. Beland) to strike out, 1729
agreed to, 1730
Dominion archives, 1730
Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also that title*
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Policing, 778
Power for running elevators, 1025
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Quebec, 4614
Terrebonne, 2690, 4615

Public Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, 1025
Rockhead hospital, Halifax, 4613
St. John quarantine building, 1021, 1457, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Saskatchewan, 1023, 4629
Souris, 4614
Sussex, N.B., 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Public Debt. *See also* Address; Budget; Debt; Finance; Immigration; Loans
Additions to, 2641, 2985, 3078. *See also under this title,* Increase
Budget, particulars of, 2898
Canadian National Railways, fixed charges, qu. 3323
Deficit, 3028
Increase of, 23, 91, 2814, 3072
From 1896-1922, 1173
From 1914–1923, 2842
Inheritance of present government, 2831
Interest, 2963, 2967, 3061
Magnitude of, 2963
Maturing obligations, 3822
Net debt and estimated additions, 2926
New York loan, 1922, 630, 649
Per capita debt, 2797, 2814, 2956, 2986
British Columbia, 2941
Problem of, 2784
Production cost and, 640
Reduction of, 2825, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Tariff reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 2964
War burden, 2967, 2985
Years 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914

Public Expenditure. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Government, Economy
Administration, cost of, 2785
Apportionment of, 1072, 4560
Audit. *See* Board of Audit Bill
Civil government, cost of, 2968
Demand for, 3076
East and West, 3436
Economy. *See* Ministers, Salaries
Estimate for 1923-24, 2642
Expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Extravagance, 3043
Immigration, on, 1208
Increase, 1913-23, 2842
In excess of revenue, 1230
Profitable and productive, 3005
Public Works on, 2785
Railways, appropriation by Parliament, 4397

Public Expenditure—*Con.*
Reduction of, 2986, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Retrenchment, 2784
Special bills instead of estimates, 4304
Supplementary estimates, 4420
Taxation and, 3001
Total of $548,750,714, 4554
War, 2920
1914-1922, qu. 914

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours and Rivers

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; School Lands

Public Libraries
Postal rates, 1809
Sales tax, 1870

Public Life
Integrity of,3021
Rewards of, *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Public Ownership, 4190. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways, 1614, 1618
Coal mines, 2727
Elevators, 2956
Proportional representation and, 426
Public utilities and large-scale industries, 2728
Railways, 1770, 2727, 2859, 2905, 2956, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190
Radial, 2475
Tariff taxation, 2905
Toronto street railways, 2475

Public Service. *See also* Civil Service
Militia pension to retired officers in. *See* Militia Pensions

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Extension of Calder Act for one year)
Res. 3323, 3402; 1r., 3403; 2r., com., 3r., 3977

Public Utilities. *See also* Public Ownership
Industrial disputes, 1703

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Applications for, 2830
Bridges. *See that title*
Commitments, 961, 962

Public Works—*Con.*
Department
Chief Architect's branch, qu. 2517
Engineering branch, salaries, 1017
Engineers' reports, 4571
Morrison claim, on, 4723
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 1716, 2671, 2684, 4554, 4594
House of Commons furniture, qu. 1138
Hunter, Mr. J. B., deputy minister, salary, 4671
Paymaster, qu. 1257
St. Laurent, Late Mr. A., appreciaton, 1006
Salaries, 2684
Sullivan, Mr. A. W., 381
Dredging, 1009, 4590
British Columbia, 1014
Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009, 4591
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Port Burwell, 1012
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Dry docks. *See also* Dry Dock Act Amdt. bill
Champlain, 2681
Esquimalt, 2671
Prince Rupert, qu. 1664
Vancouver, 2671
Expenditure, 3073, 3076
By provinces, qu. 3387
Graving docks, locks, etc., 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Local improvement taxes
Calgary, 1023
Kitchener, 1022
National gallery, 1018
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950
Roads and bridges, 1014. *See also* Bridges; Highways
Rugs for departmental offices, qu., 1486
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682, 4590. *See also that title*
Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers
St. John river, statement of Premier Veniot, qu. 1488
Wireless stations, 3337

Publication of Evidence. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Publications. *See* Government Publications

Publicity. *See also* Immigration; Press
Advertising, United States firms. *See* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Agent in London, Cranfield, Mr. W. T., 2927, 2983, 4707

Publicity—*Con.*
Racing information. *See* Race Track Betting

Publishers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Pugsley, Hon. William
Alien enemy property, 3823
Appointment, under Inquiries Act, qu. 1486, qu. 1993, 2498, 2494, 2710, 3043
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., and, exchange of compliments, 2503
Reparation claims, investigation, qu. 4753
Salary, 3043

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lake of the Woods bill; Labour; Lumber; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken); Natural Resources; Timber
Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2572
Gaspe, 1242
Hudson Bay region, possibilities, 1072
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Newsprint. *See also under this title,* Paper
Exemption from sales tax, 2979, 2999, 3046
Ten per cent duty proposed, 1267
Paper
Book paper, price in Canada and United States, 829
Control, 2572
Cost and sales tax, 2888
Magazine paper, prices, Canada and United States, 829
Manufacturers, payment of sales tax, 4415
Products, French treaty, 1981, 1987
Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 2886
Pulpwood
Destruction by spruce bud worm, 818
Export of, 2711, 2950
Duty on, 2828
Freight rates, 3036
Permit to cut, 4206
Prices, 3036, 4345
Prohibition of export, 2648, 2750, 3416, 4012
See also Export Act Amdt. Bill
Royal commission to inquire into, 2648, 2711, 2948, 2950, 3412, 3413, 4709
Settlers and farmers, 4513
Riordan Company, business profits tax, qu. 1974, 4490

Pulpwood. *See this title* under Pulp and Paper

Purchasing Commission, 114, qu. 1385, 1674
Authority for, qu. 2699
Beer, Mr. L. H., 4704
La Fleche, Col. L. R., 4001
Salary, 3950
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Supervision, government purchases and sales, 3950, 4001

Purchasing Power, 629, 637, 2928. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Combines; Credits; Imperial Economic Conference; Money: Prices
Dollar, 3024
Europe, depreciation of, 1859
Farmers, 1408, 1851
Lack of, 4053
Limitation of, 2716
Money, 1168, 4067, 4666
Reduced, 2737, 2812
Tariff and, 2737
Unemployment and, 2725
Work and saving, necessary to increase, 2743

Pure-Bred Cattle. *See* Live Stock, accredited herds

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, mover, 9. Visit of their Excellencies to West; deceased members, 10; beauty and history of Maritime provinces, 10-11; natural resources; new leader of Progressive party, 11; Vimy Ridge site donated by France; trade relations with France and Italy; Near East crisis, 12-13; Canadian National Railways, new board of directors; Moncton Intercolonial headquarters, 13; Sir Henry Thornton, 13-14; pension rights of Grand Trunk employees; Great lakes shipping investigation, 14; cattle embargo; diminution of unemployment; improved economic conditions; member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rheaume) 15
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4061
British preference, attitude of Mr. Senn, 2959
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3440
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal, 1769
New board of directors, 13
Cheque tax, 3034
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 525
Civil Service appointments, 376

Putnam, Mr. Harold—*Con.*
Combines bill, 2597, 2618, 2626
Registrar, inquiry, 2626
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Farmers' earnings, 2813
French treaty bill, 2248
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 242
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2437, 2445, 2457, 2463
Judges, 2464
Nationality, dual, 2445
Secretary of State
Administration, 2464
Power of, 2457
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3515, 3569
Patents of Invention bill, 2071
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2918
Renovated butter, 4268
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Trade commissioners, 856
Truro
Park, 3440
Subway, 4454

Quarantine. *See* Health

Quebec (city)
Arsenal, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Champlain market station, 4446
Civil Service employes, 387
Demers, Mr. A., mail contractor, qu. 1868
Immigrants, supplies, 496
Immigration dept. employees, qu., 2517, qu. 3141, qu., 3144, qu., 4302, qu.,4752
Quebec battlefields commission, 3432
Historic sites, 3406
Riots, 893

Quebec (port)
Cattle shipments, 2807
Champlain graving dock, 2675, 2682
Cold storage, 2055
Grain
Congestion, 3765
Diversion to, 3765
Elevator, 3768
Shipment, 4233
Wheat, qu. 3820
Harbour commissioners, names and salaries, qu. 1136
Lorne graving dock, 2682
St. Charles river improvement works, 4446
Transcontinental railway and, 3681

Quebec (province)
Agricultural conditions, 1908, 2764
Bankruptcy. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Civil Code. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Community of property, 2880
Dairying industry, cold storage, 2764
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Emigration to United States, 1404, 2834
Experimental farms, 459
Harbours and rivers, 950, 1008, 4588. *See also that title*
Highways, 814, 2341, 3180. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1085, 1104, 1198, 1200
Indians, 2124
Labelle county development, 4199
Legislature , Bankruptcy Act, 3091
Northern, conditions, 3037
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public buildings, 4614
Railways, 4189
Repatriation of Canadians, 1085

Quebec Conference, 2348

Quebec-North Shore St. Lawrence steamship service, 2175

Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4405

Quebec Savings Bank Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 4183; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Queen Charlotte Islands, 150

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Agriculture dept. officials attending fairs (Mr. Leader) 285
Arctic expedition (Mr. Parent) 4012
Bacon imports and exports (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 938
Canada Temperence Act, correspondence (Mr. Stevens) 1032
Canadian National Railways
Coal purchases (Mr. Hanson) 4303
Doctors, employment (Mr. d'Anjou) 814
Dorchester employees (Mr. Cannon) 2088
Fixed charges (Mr. Euler) 708
Hotels, (Mr. Coote) 938
Mileage (Mr. Tobin) 914
Statistics, (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Canadian Pacific Railway, (Mr. Kellner) 626; (Mr. Lucas) 625, 3704
Civil Service
Inside and outside (Mr. McQuarrie) 3264

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Quebec city and district, (Mr. Cannon), 387
Returned soldiers (Mr. McKillop) 386
Statistics (Mr. Crerar) 207
Temporary employees, (Mr. Archambault) 1385
Made permanent (Mr. Archambault) 814
Customs and excise duties (Mr. Black, Huron) 814
Customs officials, Halton county (Mr. Anderson) 914
Dominion lands, pre-emption area (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Dorchester penitentiary, (Mr. Michaud) 494
Exports and products, agricultural (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 814
Fuel
Joint Peat Com. (Mr. Irvine) 387
Lignite Utilization board (Mr. Irvine) 387
Grain and grain trade
Elevator overages (Mr. Millar) 494
Terminal elevators (Mr. Stevens) 3821
Highways
Dundas street (Mr. Anderson) 708
Projected, Ontario (Mr. Wilson) 624
Quebec, (Mr. Prevost) 814
Immigration, staff transfer, (Mr. Lavigueur) 2517
Income tax collections (Mr. Black, Huron) 733
Indian reserves, grain production (Mr. Evans) 1139
Levis
Dry dock, (Mr. Archambault) 1261
Postmasters (Mr. Bourassa) 519
Montreal, grain shipments, (Mr. Coote) 1974
National Defence, payments (Mr. Boys) 386
Oleomargarine, butter and (Mr. Sutherland) 386
Purchasing Commission, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1385
Railway grades, etc. (Mr. McBride) 625
Railway statistics (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Sales tax exemptions (Sir Henry Drayton) 708
School lands (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Soldiers' Settlement Board, Edmonton, (Mr. Boys) 3506
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome (Mr. Kay) 4012
Valcartier camp grounds (Mr. Delisle) 2298

Race Equality. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Naturalization

Race Track Betting, 3059. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
M. (Mr. Good) 494, 709-764, neg. on div. 766

Radial Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Radiotelegraphy, 3337. *See also* Telegraphs and Telephones; Wireless
Licenses, 3338
Revenue, 3337
Manitoba, arrangement with, 3338
Military signal service, 3338
Post office and, 1780
Radio-direction finding, qu. 3820
Radiotelegraph regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Wireless service, etc., 3374

Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. Bill (License fees)
Res. 2086, 2284; 1r., 2287; 2r., 2467; com., 2468; 3r., 2468
Sections and substitutes discussed:
Apportionment of fees, 2468
Broadcasting stations, 2468
Licenses, 2467

Railway Act 1919 Amdt. Bills
1. Freight rates, discrimination (Mr. Stevens) 1r., 54
2. Return tickets (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
3. Rates, equalization of; grain movement. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton), 1r., 730

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
Appeal from to Privy Council, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Branch lines, approval of, 4327
Canadian National Railways, and, 666
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Appeal to Privy Council, 1912
Calgary speech, 3191
Letter to boards of trade, British Columbia, 1915, 1945
Letter from Vancouver Board of Trade, 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 3188
Removal of, 3188
Commissioners
Addresses and occupations previous to appointment, qu. 1973
Names, salaries, etc., qu. 1260
Establishment of board in 1903, 1929
Estimates, 3188
Judgment, June 30th, 1922, 1914
Lake grain rates, 4218. *See also that title*

Railway Commissioners—*Con.*
Langley, Hon. Mr., statement, 3190
Maclean, Mr. S. J., pamphlet, 3194
Manitoba—Canadian Northern agreement, 1932
Parliamentary interference with, 1762
Rates, fixing, 1761
Report, eighteenth annual, 1659
Rutherford, the late Dr., 3192
Shipping rates, control of, qu. 2611
Subsidized steamboats, rates, 2174, 4003
Western Canada, representation, 3192

Railway Mail Service. *See* Post Office

Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway
Accidents, 3957
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 1558
Appropriations, statement, 2926
Baltimore and Ohio, promotion, 2828
Branch lines, 1568, 1735, 3006. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4339, 4344
Gaspe, 1243
Calgary & Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Caraquet and Gulf Shore, purchase, qu. 1258, 2938, 2939
Construction, 1440
Co-operation of, 1965
Deficits, 2747
Department. *See* Railways and Canals
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Earnings, flour transportation, Buffalo-New York, 2960
Electrification, 3422
Excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Express charges, 2876
Freight rates. *See that title*
Gaspe-Edmundston, 1243
Gaspe peninsula, 4186
Grades, rates, qu. 625, 1917
Grain shipments, diversion, 2898. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, 1618
Highways and motors, 1619
Immigration and land settlement, 1180, 1193, 2801, 1337
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
James Bay railway, 1036-49, 1073, 1402
Labour, organized, 126, 1426. *See also* Labour
Land grants to, 1353
Lands, purchases, sales, 1739
Late Minister of. *See* Kennedy, Hon. W. C.

Railways—*Con.*
Maritime provinces, 4186
Michigan Central bridge, Niagara Falls, qu. 1864
Minister of, appointment, Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
New York Central, promotions, 2828
Pacific-Great Eastern, 4700
Peace River district, 1433, 3006. *See also that title*
Pennsylvania, promotions, 2828
Pools and running rights, 3058
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Problems of, 1880. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Public ownership, 2956. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Radial, 3056
Railway labour, wages, 2876, 3190
Railway mail service, 4529. *See also* Post Office
Payments for, qu. 3143
Railway rates, equalization. *See* Freight Rates
Railway subsidies, 2902, 4303
St. John valley railway, 4311
Settlement, western provinces, 2833
Settlements far removed from, 3431
Shipping facilities. *See* St. John; Vancouver
Statistics, 207
Strikes. *See* Labour
Surveys and inspections, 4691, 4698
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario, 1071, 3056
Ties
Freight rates, 3036
Prices, 3036
Transfer charges, 2876
United States, 1618. *See also that title*
Company-owned, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix across Maine, 2902

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals; Railways
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canals. *See that title*
Department
Bell, Major Graham A., deputy minister, salary, 3195, 4557
Canada Highways Commission, 2489. *See also* Highways
Contingencies, further amount, 3377
Estimates, 1619, 2489, 3173, 3188, 3195, 3376, 3650, 3610, 3676, 3760

Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed minister, 2295
Intercolonial-Prince Edward Island pensions, 3195
Minister, appointment of, 519, 2295
Inquiry, 1081
Printing and stationary, outside service, 3197
Railway surveys and inspections, 3648
Salaries, 3195
Water powers, 3421
Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697
Expenditure by provinces, qu. 3887

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee
Change in personnel, 2252
Report, 2252

Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Raisins and Dried Currants. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff; Fruit

Ralph Connor, writings, immigration, 1181

Ralston Commission. *See* Pensions, Royal Commission

Ralston, Col. J. L. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Raney, Hon. W. E. *See* Ontario

Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Raw Materials, free trade in, 2858

Rawding, Mr., Clementsport, N.S., postmaster, 1795

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 160. Conditions in West as portrayed by western members, 160; congratulations to Mr. Forke; tariff for revenue, 161; the amendments; redistribution; Near East crisis, 162; attitude of Prime Minister, 163-164; status of Canada and foreign policy of Great Britain, 165; Canada's participation in wars of 1763 and 1812, 165-166
Budget, 2741. Cheerful sentiments of member for Skeena; tribute to Minister of Finance; budget acceptable to country; "standing pat"; "tariff stability" 2741; British preference; sales tax; beet sugar tax; wines; criticism of Sir Henry Drayton; French treaty; comparison of Canadian and United States catalogue prices, 2742; emigration to

Raymond, Mr. W. G.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
United States; cost of living; Canadians coming back; election of 1921; tariff issue; tariff concessions to Progressive party; an unresponsive attitude; wealth, levy upon; national debt; banks; widows and orphans; stockholders; capital and labour, 2743; purchasing power; natural resources, valuable only when developed; capital and capitalists, antagonism to; communists, socialists, anarchists, Bolshevists; property, protection of; Russia, example of; sugar, reduction of duty; postal war tax; postal rates, comparison Canada with United States, 2744; tariff, more important questions than, 2745; grain and grain trade; transportation; immigration and tariff go hand in hand; revenue proposals of Progressive party; income tax, proposal to increase; luxuries, taxation of; land tax; free trade, 2745; United States, trade with; tariff not a theoretical question; no surrender of Canadian market, 2746
French treaty bill, 2245
Agricultural implements, 2246
Agricultural products, 2247
Luxuries, 2742
Postage, war tax, 2744
References to speech on budget, 2747, 2756, 2787
Secession, 2244

Raymond and Talbot, Messrs., Rimouski harbour claim, 4588

Readjustment of Representation. *See* Redistribution Bill

Rebellion of 1837, 1365

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Reciprocity with United States, 85, 1196, 1223, 1246, 2243, 2810, 2948, 2966, 3049. *See also* speeches on Budget; Markets; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty; United States
Agricultural implements, 3017
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3016
Authority to negotiate, 3016
Blaine, late Hon. James G., statement, 2922
Boots and shoes, 3016, 3499
Building brick, 3017
Cattle industry and, 3082. *See also Live* Stock; Markets

Reciprocity with United States—*Con.*
"Clear-cut" issue, 3081
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493
Commercial union, 3906,3907, 3911
Commission of 1897, 3014
Fetish of, 2952
Fishing interests and, 2906, 3082, 3906
Goods on free list, 3017
Great Britain-France, 3050. *See also Treaties,* French Treaty
Herschell, Lord, 3014
History of, 2842
Leather, 3017
Markets for manufactured products, 2856
Natural and manufactured products, 2910
Natural resources, interchange, 2910
"Noble Eighteen," 2908
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2838, 2843, 2847, 2854, 2909, 2910, 2917, 2922, 2934, 2937, 2958, 2972, 2977, 2992, 3011, 3013, 3016, 3060, 3078, 3454, 3473, 3901, 3905
Fruits and vegetables, 2977
New York Times, 2968
Permanency, 3017, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2842, 2910, 2918, 3013
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718, 2778, 2832, 2931
Campaign, 2734, 3014
Defeat of, 1233, 2851, 2922, 2924, 2931
Conservative alliance with Nationalists, 2924
Evidence of attitude, Liberal party, 3010
Herring drawn across trail, 3013
Letter, Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, 3081
Liberals who opposed, 2851
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3015, 3075, 3080
Omissions from proposed agreement, 3902
Western provinces, opposition to, 2854
Screen for failure to implement tariff pledges, 2951
Sentiment towards, 3082
Standing offer by Canada and United States, 3016.
Termination of recent arrangement, 2993
Treaty of 1818 weapon in dealing with United States, 2906
Use of Canadian ports by fishing vessels, 2906

Reclamation. *See* Dominion Lands; Interior; Lands

Reconstruction in Europe, 3003. *See also* Germany, Reparations

Recreation Grounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; National Parks and Reservations

Red Cross Society
Grant to, 2169
Vetcraft shops, 694

Red Deer
Hebridean immigrants, 3584. *See also* Imgration
Valley, Coal Operators' Association, 1275

Red River, Manitoba, wharf, 1000

Redistribution, 27, 40, 162. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution Bill
Delay, 2400
Electoral reforms. *See* Proportional Representation
Intention of government, inquiry, 4250
Ivel, Mr. W. M., reported employment, 733
Marshall, Mr. Duncan and, 3313
Nova Scotia, and, 73
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Welland, Lincoln, Haldimand counties, 667

Redistribution Bill (Readjustment of representation in the House of Commons)
1r., 250-254; 2r., 436; ref. to Special Com., 487, 572-574
Special Committee, 2979
Leave to report, 857, 937
Number of members, 488-9
Privilege, Mr. Sutherland, 1660
Reference to, 487, 572-4
Reports, qu. 2612
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4593, concurred in, 4736-42

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Budget, 2830. Tribute to Ministers of Finance and Railways; rural mail system; immigration; public works; Canadian National Railways; public debt; national problems; natural resources; oriental immigration, 2830; western provinces, conditions Ontario and Quebec, industrial development and agricultural depression; Maritime provinces, commercial disadvantage due to remoteness of market; equitable treatment of all provinces; educational opportunities, 2831

Re-Establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reforestation. *See* Forests and Forestry

Reform of Senate. *See* Senate

Regimental Funds. *See* National Defence

Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518

Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.; Bankruptcy Act

Reid, Capt. John, Hudson Bay railway, 1046

Reindeer in "Barren Lands", Mr. Stefansson's statement, 1073

Rejected Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456

Relief Work. *See* Unemployment

Renfrew postmastership, qu. 205

Renovated Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Rents. *See* Cost of Living; Public Buildings

Reparations, 2498, 4653. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Pugsley; War Claims

Repatriation. *See* Immigration; Naturalization Act

Repentigny, Que. wharf, 977

Reports Tabled, 3, 8-9, 33, 54, 74, 99, 122, 202, 250, 331, 574, 812, 767, 911, 936, 986, 1080, 1156, 1307, 1361, 1384, 1539, 1631, 1659, 1686, 1910, 2204, 2252 2611, 2837, 2885, 2926, 4075, 4510

Representation. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Readjustment of. *See* Redistribution

Research. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Central research institute, 788
Helium, discoveries in, 703, 4439
Medical discoveries, 1287. *See also* Banting, Reward for. *See titles,* M. (Mr. Ladner)
Scientific and industrial research
Discoveries, 4439
Honorary advisory council
Expenditure, qu. 731
Oil shale deposits, 2514
Patents of invention, 2082

Reservations. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Reserves. *See* Indians

Resignation of Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Resolutions, The Ninety-Two. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis)

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Responsible Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Restaurants, profiteering, 2586

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, 3551

Retired Officers. *See also* Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill
Indian Army officers, settlement in British Columbia, 1096

Retirement Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service

Returned Soldiers. *See* Civil Service; Labour, Unemployment; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill,
(Application in force though applicant died before delivery of policy; decision to be reviewed)
Res. 3582, 3743; 1r., 3745; 2r., com., 3r., 3892; Senate amdts. 4734, 4750

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuters' News Service, 4712

Revenue. *See also* speeches on Budget; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; Revenue Bills; Taxation; Trade
Amdt. (Mr. Forke), 3016
Collected during war, 2985
Direct taxation, 2836
Estimate of, 3074
1923-24, 2642
Expenditure and, 3064
French treaty and, 1983. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Income tax, 2858
Unearned income, 3026
Luxuries, tax on, 2858
Methods of raising, 2784, 3016. *See also* Taxation
New sources, 2828, 2909
Progressive policy and, 2817
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913
Tariff, 2745, 3025
Reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 3301
Unearned income, 2954, 3026

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
2. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4505
3. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; com., 4392; 3r., 4393
4. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2656, 3922, 4181, amended, 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Revenue Stamps. *See* Post Office

Revised Statutes, procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974

Rheaume, Mr. J. T. (Jacques Cartier)
Address, in reply, seconder, 16; late Mr. Lafortune, 16; Canada's financial condition; marked progress in industry; necessity for increased immigration, 17
Introduced, 3

Rhineland. *See* Germany

Rice, freight rates, 1915

Richmond and Wolfe Counties
Accredited herds, qu., 813
Soldier settlement, 913

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, expenditure, 4627

Right of Appeal. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.

Right, Petition of. *See* Petition of Right

Riley, Mr. E. T., 60

Riley's Army, transportation, 3042

Rimouski Harbour
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Wharf, 977

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4145
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4195
Canadian Press, Limited, 2587
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2587
Copyright Act, 2343
M. for amendment of, 495
Deputy Ministers, French language, 1805-08
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1805

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Emigration to the United States, 1173
Farm labour, 1174
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Empire settlement scheme, 1175
Policy, 1172
Restriction of, 1174
Newspaper postage, 4535
Population, net increase, 1173
Post offices, number in Montreal, qu. 3135
Public debt, increase, 1896-1922, 1173
Public ownership of railways, 4195
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 720
Royal Academy of Arts bill, 281
Rural depopulation, 1174
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4185
Wine and beer excise taxes, qu. 518

Riordon Pulp and Paper Company
Business profits tax, 4490
Arrears, qu. 1974

Riots, Aid of militia in. *See* National Defence; Troops

Rivière du Lièvre wharf, 978

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Agricultural conditions, 1837, 1846
Agricultural implements, standardization, 796
Australia
Trade treaty with, 1848, 3475, 3476
Visit to, 1848-49, 2815, 3017, 3474, 3475
Belgian exposition, 496
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3457
Woollen goods, 3459
Business conditions, review of, 1837, 1846
Canada-West Indies treaty, 3378
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, 3385
Canadian travelling exhibition in France, 4712
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 4290
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 487, 2139, 2287, 2343, 2436, 3154
Amdt. clause 2, 2291
Cost of living, 1812
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine), 651
Dairying industry, 1839
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 663
Farm mortgages, 1839
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4549
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
French treaty bill, 2239
Balance of trade, 2239
Boots and shoes, 2240
Bronze powder, 2017
Favoured nation, 2242
Fuel supply, 796
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 811
Government publications, 811
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of grain at United States ports, 3649, 3961
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 4709
Litigation, 2045
Validity, 782
Dockage, 783
Elevators
Edmonton, 4718
Government
Grain passing through, 2037
Value, 2037
Halifax, 4714
Lethbridge, 4718
Mixing, 2036
Montreal, short weights, complaint, 2037
Ontario, 2037, 2039
Quebec, grain shipment, 4233
Screenings, 2039, 2041, 2254
Vancouver improvements, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commissioners, board of, 2036
Salaries, 4709
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1764, 4710, 4711
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1210
Rates, 4290
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Screenings, 2254
Shipments, congestion, 3767
Transportation, insurance, 3764
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 4587
Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 3960, 4218-35, 4276, 4285, 4290
Lake grain rates, royal commission, 4710
Report, 2885, 3045
London Corn Exchange, complaint, 3649
Oil bounty, Alberta, 2510
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Oil, fuel and lubricating, standardizing, 809
Oriental immigration, 507
Patents of Invention bill, 331, 2064, 2083, 2087, 3154

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Patents of Invention—*Con.*
Appeal to Exchequer court, 2080
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2065, 2128
Domicile, election of, 2070
Foreign patents, 2068
Petroleum bounties, 780
Raisins and dried currants, 3476. *See also under this title,* Australia
Russian trade mission, 987
Shipping combines, prosecution, 4228
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4701
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3377
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3385
Contracts, 2172
Inspection, 2178
Mackenzie river, 2176
Magdalen islands, 2174
Mediterranean, proposed, 1637
Northern Alberta, 2176
Pictou-Magdalen islands, 2174
Railway Commission and, 4004
Rates, control of, 2174
Subventions, 2171
Victoria-West Coast-Vancouver island, 4003
Toronto seed branch building, 4625
Trade. *See also under this title,* Australia, French Treaty
Annual report, 1910
Commissioners, 1837
Exports, 1838
Oriental, 507
West Indies-Col. Amery, 3392
Trade and Commerce dept.
Canada Grain Act, 2035
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 2033, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701
Patents and Copyright branch, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade Marks and Designs bill, 331, 2063, 2293
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Wheat board legislation, 2696
Extension by order in council, 3045
Woollen industry, protection, 930

Roberge, Mr. Eusèbe (Megantic)
Introduced, 3

Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Roberts, Hon. W. F., secession, 3145

Roberval, Que. wharf, 978

Robichaud, Mr. J. G. (Gloucester)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4120
Budget, 2935. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Progressive party; policy futile and action ill-advised, 2935; economic conditions and remedies; "blue ruin" speeches; confidence in future; remedy proposed worse than disease; conditions prior to 1896; return of Liberal party under Sir Wilfrid Laurier; revival of business; depression following war; country again on road to prosperity; trade revival shown by import and export figures, 2936; Banking and Commerce committee, inquiry; British preference, increase of; direct importation; reciprocity with United States; Canadian seaports, 2937; Bay of Fundy; Shippegan; Hudson Bay railway; wheat shipment, facilities of eastern ports; Sir Sandford Fleming, report, 2938; Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway; comparative mileages, 2939; National railway policy; fishing industry; disabilities under United States tariff; legislation; modus vivendi; secession talk, 2940
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3394
Coastal regulations, suspension of, 2960
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3365
Fish, express rates on, 3365
Introduction, 3
Pensions, 3710
Vimy Ridge memorial, 184
Wharves, revenue, 976

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (King's, N.S.)
Address in reply, 72; redistribution, effect on Nova Scotia; immigration campaign; condition of European markets, 73
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 879
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 834

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Montreal post office, daylight saving, qu. 3143

Robson, Judge. *See* Combines

Roche, Hon. W. J., 354-5. *See also* Civil Service Commission

Rockefeller Foundation, hospital standardization, 2934

Rocky Mountain Park. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Rodin's Statue of France, 2832

Rods. *See* Copper Bars or Rods; Steel

Roentgen, discoverer of X-rays, 1287

Rogers, Hon. Robert, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Rondeau, Ont. pier, 983

Root Vegetables. *See* Vegetables

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection, Bill (Inspection certificate evidence of grade and condition). Mr. Caldwell. 1r., 937

Rosoman, Mr. Cyril E., postmaster, Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Ross, Mr. George. *See* Post Office

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Annual drill, 4636
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Breakwaters, appropriations for, 4563
British preference, woollen industry, 3462
Budget, 2932. Amendment; Finance Minister's statement unsatisfactory; Liberal platform of 1919; European unrest and dissatisfaction; British navy best guarantee of peace; exodus; reasons for the movement; preference of British immigrants for Australia and New Zealand, 2932; proposals to disband mounted police, discontinue miltary training and curtain naval service; pre-election promises and pledges; food prices not going down; tuberculin test; special delivery letters, cost of; military training expenditure and results; cabinet ministers—are they required?; income tax, widows' exemption; reciprocity; domination of United States; educational system; medical course; standardization of hospitals;political and social system; weighing and measuring babies; moral influence; Canada's favourable position; not advisable to open door to United States, 2934; chief reliance upon British stock; confidence in courage and bravery of French-Canadian race, 2935
Cadet services, 879
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Certified milk, 3300
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 540
Grant, Dr., civil service, 541

Ross, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3594
Hector celebration, 4636
Immigrants rejected, 706, qu. 1992
Medical advisory boards, 697
Military hospitals, qu. 282, 669, 673
Maintenace cost, qu. 812
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Milk pasteurization, 3300
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3724
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743
Portsmouth postmaster, 1832
Shipping rates, 3783
Soldiers' Civil Re-establshment
Hospitals. *See under this title,* Military hospitals
Salaries, 669
Soldier settlement, 2030
Board, qu. 2180
Ontario, qu. 492
Salaries, 2017
Tuberculin test, 2933, 3284, 3300
Welland canal construction, 3782

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Collingwood harbour dredging, 4578
Feeding Stuffs Act, conference, 606
Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, qu. 707
Millfeeds conference, 606
Postal appointments, 1801
Rural mail carriers
Compensation for loss, 1833
Remuneration, 1792

Roumanian Loan, qu. 623, 2010

Rowell, Hon. N. W., 318

Royal Academy of Arts, Bill respecting, (Mr. Rinfret) 1r., 281

Royal Assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 866. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Naturalization
Cape Sabine, post, 3944
Cost and estimates, 1148
Duties, seven day week, 4514
Enforcement of federal statutes, 699, 777
Espionage, 1142
Estimates, 774, 1163
Fitzpatrick, Mr. F. J. E., article in Maple Leaf, 1140
Force and officers, 1141

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—*Con.*
Investigations and convictions by, 1144-5
Legal adviser, Mr. Donald Downie, 777
Motions for disbandment of, 2933
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 816, 1139, neg. on div, 1152
Naturalization, 779. *See also that title*
Nelson district withdrawal from, 2943
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, enforcement, 697
Ottawa departmental buildings, policing, 778
Pay, 777
Pensions, 774, qu. 1362
Reorganization, 776
Scrip, qu. 1362
Seizure of books and property, 1142
Strength and work of force, 1144

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Royal Commissions. For individual commissions, *see their titles*
Appointments to, 2710. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1209-1212
Judges and, 3604
Lake grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. *See* Steamship Services

Royal Military College, 4628

Royal Naval College. *See* Esquimalt

Royal Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Rugs, for departmental offices, qu. 1486

Ruhr District, invasion. *See* Germany, Reparations

Rules of the House. *See* House of Commons

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Marcil; Speaker

Rural Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Rural Credits. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits

Rural Depopulation, 35, 1126, 1165, 1174, 1182, 1189, 1234, 1394, 1406, 1432, 1844, 1860, 1906. *See also* Emigration; Farmers; Labour; Population
Causes of, 1133
Economic conditions, 1856

Rural Depopulation—*Con.*
Great Britain in, 1854
United States, 2829
Wealth, production of, 1856

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Post Office, Postmasters

Rush-Bagot Treaty. *See* Treaties

Russell, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868

Russia
Bolshevism, 2744
Immigration, 1340, 2845
Relations with, 44-45, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986, 987

Rutherford Commission. *See* Race Track Betting

Ryckman, Mr. E. B. (East Toronto)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Budget, 2912. Budget disappointing; accounts not balanced, currency depreciated, exchange unfavourable; trying to satisfy too many factions; incidence of taxation; summer trade; stability not finality; sales tax; pyramiding; passing on to farmer, housewife and labourer, 2912; cigarette tax; income tax; production and revenue lessened; based on fallacy that taxation of rich relieves poor; Mr. Otto H. Kahn; income tax reduction in United Kingdom and United States, 2913; capital diverted from industry to tax free bonds; immigration and investment discouraged; graduated income tax; alternative between new taxation or economy, 2914; ministers' salaries and members' indemnities; aristocracy of spending; civil service; finances complicated; ordinary and war expenses should be specially provided for, 2915; substitution of turnover for sales tax; farmers and the tariff; price comparison between Canada and United States; William Henry Seward on United States tariff, 2916; not enough protection; reciprocity in tariff taxation; imports of agricultural products; farmers' national policy; reciprocity proposals, 2917; reciprocity agreement of 1911; United States out for themselves; war debts; United States would "crash through any agreement"; 2918; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2919

Ryckman, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Canadian National Railways
New positions and salaries, 2701
Paris offices, 3631, 3680
Cheque tax, 3933
Combines bill, 2630
Appointments, 2665
Technicalities, 2665
Government elevators, value, 2037
Labour dept., economies, 1624
Masters and mates, 2668
Patents of Invention bill, 2070
Domicile, election of, 2072
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3864, 3881
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2468
Toronto harbour improvements, 984, 2678, 4578

St. Alexis wharf, 980

St. Andrew's Dam fishway, 1000

St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

St. Andrew's lock, 2682

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière
Experimental farm, 460, qu. 1028

Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 979

Ste. Anne's lock, Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph line, qu. 3138, qu. 3262

St. Barnabe Nord postmaster, 1830

St. Bruno postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3140

St. Charles wharf, 980

Ste. Claire postmaster, qu. 1031

St. Croix
Harbour, 2899, 2938
River, bridges, 2342

St. David postmistress, 1489

St. Jean d'Evangeliste, postmaster, qu. 2698

St. Jean d'Orleans wharf, 980

St. John, N.B. (city)
Employment office, 3453
Immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Martello tower, 3444
Members of Parliament, visit to, 2503
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Water supply, 1022
Station, 2481, 3188, 3645, 4310, 4445
Terminals, train shed, 3188, 3645
Warehouse facilities, 308

St. John, N.B. (port), 2676
Canadian National Railways, 1767
Grain shipments, 261, qu. 1484
Harbour commissioners, qu. 911
Importation through. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Improvements, 109, 4610
Courtenay bay, 109, 2676
Pilots, 3358
Wharfage tolls, 975

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill
(Extension of time)
Res. 3145, 3403; 1r., 2r., com., 3405; 3r., 3406

St. John-Bay of Fundy steamship service, 2176

St. John-Bear River steamship service, 2176

St. John-Digby steamship service, 2176

St. John River
Bridges, 2342
Sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Wharves, taking over of, qu. 1488

St. Joseph d'Alma postmaster, qu. 3140

St. Laurent, late Mr. Arthur. *See* Public Works

St. Lawrence Ship Canal, surveys, 3647
Hydrographic, 3336

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 3339
Dredge No. 12, Capt. Bilodeau, qu. 1487
Maintenance and dredging, 3375, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374. *See also* Sorel

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 2979. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Hudson Bay railway; Lake Grain Rates; Vancouver Harbour bill; Water Powers; Welland canal
Aerial survey, 1776
Expenditure, 3076
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 665
International Joint Commission, 3427
Parliamentary discussion of project, 2807
Power
Development, qu. 490, 2682
Dominion Power Board, investigation, 3427
Exportation, 658
Power canal, qu. 204
Water powers, 3782
Shipping rates. *See also* **Freight Rates,** Shipping
Grain, 3343
United States
Agreement with, 3705, 3762
Negotiations with, 665, 3208, 4513

Ste. Marie, Mr. L. T., appointment, qu. 1028

St. Mary's Cape, N.S., breakwater, 941

St. Michel de Bellechasse wharf, 980

St. Moïse, Que., agent, 1489

St. Omer, Que., wharf, 980

St. Père, Mr. E. C. (Hochelaga)
Civil Service Commission, 1188
Emigration to United States, 1188
Immigration
Agents, appointment, 1188
Farmers and farm labourers, 1188
Labour, attitude, 1186, 1187
Policy, 1186
Labour, unemployment, 1187
Repatriation, 1188

St. Peter's, N.S. postmaster, qu. 1488, 1795

Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588

St. Stephen, N.B. industrial centre, 2901

Saar Valley. *See also* League of Nations
Administration, 3995, 4000
Commission, 4653

Sackville public building, 4613

Safety League. *See* Canadian National

Sailors. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine
Institutions for assisting, 2167

Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers Bill
Res. 193; 1r., 195; 2r., 277; ref. to Agriculture Com. 277; com. 2105; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts. 3150

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Agricultural conditions, 1841
Binder twine, price, 4386
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549, 4550
Government telegraphs, qu. 383
Grain
Dockage and screenings, 786
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225-34
Marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 304
Hudson Bay railway, 3647
Labour, hours, 1841
Penitentiaries, 773
Railway department, printing, 3197
Saskatchewan Co-operative creamery, 185

Sales, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 269
Vancouver terminal elevator, qu. 517
Addition to, cost, qu. 621
Yorkton income tax office, qu. 384

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Bill; Taxation

Saline Lake Deposits, Western Canada, 3198

Salmon Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Salvage Cases. *See* Soldier Settlement

Salvation Army
Immigration, 1430, 1476, 1480-1
Canada Colonization Association, 1093
Child, 1470

Sample Market. *See* Grain, Marketing of

Sanctuaries, Birds and Wild Animals. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Sardine Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Saskatchewan. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2766
Automobiles in, 82, 148. *See also* Automobiles
Canadian Air Force, 1748-51
Co-operative creameries, 2779
Co-operative Elevator Company, 2779
Dairying industry, production, 1921, 2744
Debentures, sale of, 2770
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061, 3942
Dredging, 1012
Dunning, Premier, statement regarding budget, 2770-1
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Hail Insurance Commission, 2770
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Highways, 3185. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, domestic servants, 1099, 1476
Indians, 2145
Lands
Reclamation, 1065
Southwestern, 1353
Mennonites, 1229
Mixed farming, 2773
Public buildings, 1023, 4629
Resources, report of Mr. Crean, 1060
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, Calcutta trade commissioner, 1840
Settlers' relief, 3447
Sunset lake postmaster, claim, 1832

Saskatchewan—*Con.*
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Wheat board, res. of legislature, 3045

Saskatoon post office, 1785

Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa, Hindu franchise, 508, 4641-65. *See also* Hindus

Saturday Night, statement, labour shortage, 1125

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sayabec postmistress, dismissal. *See* Post Office; Boulay

Scandals. *See* War

Scandinavia, immigration from, 1085

Scarfe Varnish Works, qu. 1485

Schofield, Rev. Dr., res. Pension Board, 3399

Scholarships. *See* Students

Schools. *See also* Education
Attendance age, 1179
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Closed for lack of money, 1202, 1342, 1388, 2836
Lack of in the West, 1390
Lands, 3398. *See also* Dominion Lands
Reversion of, 3445
Sections reserved for. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 1385, 3982, 4202
New, opening of, 1889
Oriental children, 2326, 2485
Segregation, 1896
School homes for immigrants, 1227
Taxes, unpaid, 3256

Scientific and Industrial Research. *See* Research

Scientific Men, neglect of, 1294. *See also* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scotland, immigration from, 1876. *See also* Immigration, Hebrideans

Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, Grain Inquiry Commission, 4711

Scott, Mr. Frank. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Scottish Aid Society, immigration, 1876

Scottish Pioneer Association, Hector celebration, 4705

Screenings. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Seamen
Desertion of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference; Treaties; Ports

Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, price comparison, 2737, 2742

Secession, 2940. *See also* Maritime Provinces; Nova Scotia; Western Provinces
British Empire from, 2244
Nova Scotia; 2057, 2177, 2243-4, 2977
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement of, 3145
Talk of, 2977, 3067
Western provinces, 2808, 2814

Second Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill

Secondary Amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secret Agreement, Japanese immigration, 1448

Secret Treaties. *See* Near East Crisis

Secretary of State
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, alien enemy property, custodian, 3823, 4671
Salaries and contingencies, 2392, 2494
Naturalization. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Correspondence, Vancouver judges, 2199
Certificates, issue, 2182. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Naturalization Acts, expenses under, 2495
Public archives, 3985
War claims adjustment, 2495. *See also* Aliens; War

Securities, Issue of. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

Sedition. *See also* Criminal Code Act Amdt. Bill; Immigration Act Amdt. Bill;
Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, 1142

Seed. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Fairs, 599, 600
French treaty, 1984
Purchasing Commission, qu. 279, 599, 601
Seed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444

Seed Testing and Inspection, Bill
(Grading and qualities of seed)
Res. 195; 1r., 198; 2r., and ref. to Agriculture Com. 277-8; com.. 2304; 3r., 2308
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agricultural or garden vegetable seeds or plants, 2307
Clark, Mr. George H., 2304
New varieties, registration of, 2307
Noxious weeds, 2305
Primary, 2305
Plant, definition of, 2304
Registration through Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Sale of seeds for export, 2307
Samples to be taken in presence of witness, 2308
Seed commission, 2304
Time limit for complaint, 2308

Seeds, Noxious, 2305, 4378. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill

Seizures. *See* Customs and Excise; Fish and Fisheries

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk, Man. wharf, 1000

Senate
Abolition of, 1376
Amendments concurred in:
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 4201
Board of Audit Act, 4733
Canadian National Railways (Securities) bill, 4754
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 4536
Combines bill, 3504
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4736
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 4733
Fruit Containers bill, 3150
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 3149

Senate—*Con.*
Amendments concurred in—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 2050
Patents of Invention bill, 3154
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744-50
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4734, 4750
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4734
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 4750
Amendments, non-concurrence
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4357, 4592
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., Joint committee, 730
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4688, 4689, 4694
Rejection of, 4753
Divorce proceedings, publicity. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Elective, 2908
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1364
Estimates, salaries and contingencies, 2694, 3949
Fowler, Hon. Senator, remarks on immigration bill, 3032
Grain-carrying trade, committee report, 2899
Hudson Bay railway report. *See* Hudson Bay Railway, M. (Mr. Knox)
Joint committee. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Lougheed, Senator, remarks on Immigration bill, 3032
Members of House of Commons appointed to, 2710
Progressive party and, 1378
Reform, 2908
Senators
Age limit, 1376
Attendance, 4007, 4008
Indemnity, 4008
M. (Mr. Leader) for reduction of, 1153
Pensions, 1376
Vested right of, 1376

Senate and House of Commons
Joint Committee on matters of common interest, 4007
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Indemnity; attendance)
Res. 4184; 1r., 2r., com., 4185, 4236; amdt. (Mr. Gardiner) six months' hoist, neg. 4246; amdt. (Miss Macphail) to refer back, neg. 4247; 3r., 4247; Senate amdts. 4734

Senate and House of Commons—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Attendance of senators and members, 4007
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Personal explanation—Mr. Gervais, 4249
Sessional allowance, 4185, 4236
Amdt. (Miss Macphail) to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Accredited herd system, qu. 492
Agricultural Instruction Act, renewal of, qu. 490
Budget, 2957. Protection, adequate; tariff proposals and Liberal pre-election pledges; need of profitable markets; British preferential tariff, 2957; mistake to penalize Canadian industry; woollen industry affected by increased preference; competition from other countries; artificial silk duty; knitting factories threatened with ruin; petition against increase of British preference and alteration of sales tax; copper and hemp bounties; reciprocity; Canadian and United States duties on agricultural products, 2958; imports; home market for manufactured and agricultural products; unbalanced budget; economy; high standard of living, 2959
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Seed inspection, 198
Six Nation Indians, 1307

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Sessional Indemnity. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act

Settlement. *See* Immigration; Soldier Settlement

Settlers. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Land for. *See* Immigration
Relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Transportation facilities, 2172

Sevres Treaty. *See* Near East Crisis

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Budget, 2784. National debt, revenue; methods of raising; deficits; taxation; increase in national business; expenditure; retrenchment; immigration 2784; natural resources; retrenchment, public works, civil service, superannuation; taxation and extravagance, 2785; taxes—income, business, consumers, sales; national policy based on special privilege; tariff, downward revision;

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
labour unions; strikes; high cost of living; prices, control of; agriculture, condition of; farmers in Parliament; partisan politics, cost of; prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 2787; combines; spread between producer and consumer; disappointing budget; protective feature of tariff; the amendment
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743

Seymour Narrows, obstruction, 3333

Shale Deposits. *See* Oil

Shareholders. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (Calgary West)
Address in reply, 66. Gift from France of Vimy Ridge, 66; Parliament and economy; administration of national parks; four cardinal principles of taxation, 66-67; agriculture essential industry of Canada, 67; financial and economic depression in farming industry, 67-68; cost of grain production, 68; high transportation and insurance rates, 68-69; western grain route, 69; cattle industry and embargo; co-ordination of branches of Agriculture department; revision of Bank Act, 70; government immigration policy, 70-71; Near East crisis, government's action, 71; General Smuts at Imperial Conference of 1921; personal standing and obligation to constituents, amdt. to amdt., 72
Annual training, 864
Banff national park
Electric plant, 3436
Power rights, 496, 3750
Calgary Power Company, 3938
Springs and cave, 496
Water powers, 3420
Banff-Windermere highway, 3437
Bank Act, revision, res. Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4089-4105; 4134-4160; 4509
Bank mergers, 4134, 4150
Interest at 7 per cent, 4103
Maximum rate, amdt. 4148, neg. 4148
Shareholders' audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4089
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1505

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
Business of the House
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1302
Supply, amdt. to amdt., 1302
Business profits tax, 4491
Cadet services, 877
Calgary
Power Company, privileges, 3750
Unemployment relief, 1681-3
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 4709
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3377, 3389, 3397
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3410-13
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, combine, 1395
Canadian national parks, automobile admission fee, 3943
Canadian National Railways
Coal, purchase of, qu. 4437
Alberta, qu. 1363. 4752
Employees' pensions, 288
Paris offices, 3650-74
Transportation combine, 1395
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Canadian Press, Limited, 4712
Subsidy, 4728
Canadian representation in United States, 4664
Cheque tax, 3934
Chilled beef, 464
Civil Service Act
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253
Homestead inspectors, 3252
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 363, 382, 519
Special committee, 937
Civil Service bonus, 1664
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Civil Service Commission, 346
Combines
Bill, appointments, 2665
Transportation, 1395
Cost of living. *See also* Civil Service bonus
Freight rates and, 1958
Reduction, 1394
Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Betting information, 2282
Guessing competitions, 2282, 2283
Customs and excise, salaries, 3276
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4253
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4668
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2360
Dominion lands and parks.
Automobile admission fee, National parks, 3943
Salaries, 3250

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Egypt, British policy, 4662
Emigration to United States, 1393
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Grant, 3413
Experimental farms, 464
Freight rates, 1394
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1958
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1956
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Halibut treaty, 4132
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1690
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4645, 4664
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3130, 4442
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4690
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1396
Advances to, qu. 517
Results, 1105
Child, 1472
Estimates, 1387
Policy, 1392
Imperial Conference, 4645-63
Constitutional changes, 4664
Policy, 4662
Publicity, 4665
Indemnity of members, 4009, 4247
International Labour Conference, 1645-6
Interest rate. *See under this title,* Bank Act
Labour
Coal miners' strike, district 18, 1629
Industrial disputes investigation, 1629
Labour Gazette, 1622
Lack of Confidence vote, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 213
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225
Land speculation, 1395
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Merchants' Bank failure, 4150
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrison claim, Little Anse, 4724
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2123
Northwest Territories Act, procedure, qu. 1974
Oil-well drilling machinery, duty, 3917
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions
Appeal boards, 683
European war and active militia, 2167, 3723
Legislation, 2519
Officials, conduct of, 4703

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1649
Royal commission reports
Interim, 2167
Printing, 3401
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401
Permanent force, 892
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3130
Physical training, 877
Political patronage, 3347
Postal rates, public libraries, 1809
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4679
Privilege—Grain Growers Guide, 987
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 4629
Public expenditure, East and West, 3436
Purchasing Commission, 3950
Authority for, qu. 2699
Railway rates
Attorney General, B.C. vs. C.P.R., 1917
Railway commission judgment, 1917
Redistribution, 4741
Renovated butter, 4253
Rideau canal, 4691
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, taxes, qu. 1974
Rocky Mountain park
Hudson Bay Company claim, qu. 2418
Stipendary magistrate, 1739
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778
Rural depopulation, 1394
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, public libraries, 1870
Scholarships, international, provision for, 878
Screenings, purchase of, 785
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4185, 4238-4247
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747, 3894
Soldier Settlement Board, extension, 1128
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3346
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4077
Tariff, high protection cost, 1394
Taxation, burden of, 1394
Tourist traffic, 3437
War, Canada's participation, 4663
Water powers, 3420. *See also under this title* Banff
Western provinces, conditions, 1396
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, Standard Shipping Company, 1704
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Grain dockage, qu. 3505
Port Arthur elevator, qu. 2612
Renfrew postmastership, qu. 204
Toronto harbour dredging, 1011

Sheep-Raising Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock; Wool

Shells. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Sherwood, Mr. H. Crossley, letter, 519

Shippigan, port, 2938

Ships. *See* Vessels

Shipping and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Freight Rates, Shipping; Harbours and Rivers; Marine; Naval Service; Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Vessels
All-Canadian routes between East and West, 3273
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. *See also that title.*
Shipping combine, 4278
War claims, qu. 3142
Canadian shipyards, closing, 1338
Cattle boats. *See also* Live Stock
Alleged unsanitary condition, 2613
Space, 2133
Certificates
Certificated masters on coasting vessels, 3971
Steamship. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Dollar Shipping Company, 3273
Great Britain, 3072
Great Lake Transportation Company, lease of freighters, 3848
Harling, Thomas & Son, shipments via Panama canal, 3273
Hirtle, Schooner Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Kirkwood line, 2175, 3846
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
London Guarantee & Accident Company, qu. 1138
Ocean ports, 2898. *See also* Ports
Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Immigration
Tramp steamers, 2127
Registrar. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343

Shipping and Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Shipping associations. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Shipping combines, 3845. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Ships purchased from foreigners, 3972
Standard Shipping Company, 4278
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Steamship services. *See that title*
Strikes. *See* Labour

Shire Horses, gift to Canada, 2207, 2253

Shortages. *See* Grain

Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Sick Mariners' Dues. *See* Health

Sifton, Sir Clifford
Coal supply, 1265
Clyde, the, mechanics from, 1204
Fuel supply, 788
Hudson Bay railway, 1047
Immigration, 1181-3
Importation of British workmen, 1186
"Man with sheepskin coat" 1204
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Lake grain rates, 4285
Standard of living, 1168

Silesia, partition of, 3995

Silks. *See* Custom Tariff; Treaties, French Treaty; Textiles

Siloam, schooner. *See* Vessels

Silver. *See* Mines and Minerals

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3356
Navigation, safeguards, qu. 812

Sinclair, Mr. John A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
References to, 2996, 3012

Sinclair, Upton, press, capitalistic control, 2726

Singapore Naval Base, 2469, qu. 3506, qu. 3820, 3822, 4654

Single Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Single Tax. *See* Land; Taxation

Single Transferable Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Six Nations. *See* Indians

Skeena River. *See* British Columbia, Fishing Licenses

Sloan, Hon. William, Asiatic immigration, 1901

Smart, Mr. Bogue. *See* Immigration

Smith, Mr. A. H. *See* Drayton-Acworth Commission

Smith, Goldwin, protection, 3071

Smuggling. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Taxation

Smuts, General, 31, 72. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Imperial Conference

Snider, Judge, report, 1714

Snowden, Mr. Philip, British labour party, 2722

Social Agencies. *See* Labour, Unemployment

Social Service Council. *See* Race-Track Betting

Social Standards, work, popular attitude, 1189

Socialism, 123, 631, 2727. *See also* Labour Macolm island Finnish settlement 1247

Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Soft Drinks, tax on. *See* Confectionery and Beverages; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Soldier Advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Bill

Soldier Settlement. *See also* Soldier Settlement Board
Carleton county, farms sold, qu. 1013
Fire insurance, 496
Lands
Reversion of, 3257
Taxation, 3256, 3260
Loans
Black, Mr. W. J., 2019
Expenditures and, qu. 2207
Missisquoi and Brome counties, 4012
Ontario, qu. 492
Questionaire sent out by Miss Macphail, 1845
Richmond county, farms sold, qu. 913
Wolfe county, farms sold, qu. 913

Soldier Settlement Board, 51. *See also* Immigration
Advances under act and cost, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Amounts due Dominion government, qu. 814

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Advice and assistance to immigrants, 1126
Edmonton, insurance, 3506
Estimates, 1910, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2986
Field supervisors, location of immigrants, 1089
Hebridean immigrants, 3252, 3596
Immigration, 170, 1179, 1255, 1406
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Land sales, alleged attempt to bribe supervisors, 1091
Legal expenses, 2018
Loans, 2018
Members, salaries and expenses, qu. 2180
Moss, Mr. H. H., illegal arrest, 2030
Peace river district, 1185
Salaries, 1910, 2017
Salvage cases, qu. 206, 2018
Staff, 2018

Soldiers. *See also* National Defence; Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
British soldier, deportation, 2254
Burial of destitute, 693, 695
Hospitals, 669. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Imperial and foreign, treatment of, 691
In distressed circumstances abroad, 1456
National monument, Ottawa, 2685
Official advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Returned soldiers
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Branch banks and, 4122
Canadian legion, Victoria, B.C., res. 2942
Civil service. *See also that title*
Appointments, 1795
Dismissals, 1772
Employment, 1772
Clearing land, 1185
Deaths from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Naturalization, 1379
Pensions, 2942. *See also* Pensions
Postmasterships and, 1799
Sheltered employment, 694
Vetcraft shops, 694
Treatment of, 2942
Unemployment, 2168
Relief, 689, 1679, 1681, 2168
Vocational training, 686

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment
Department of, 113, qu. 282, 3893, 4075. *See also* National Defence; Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Amalgamation with National Defence, 3893
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Estimates, 668
Expenditure, 2967, 3893
Reduction of, 23, 2032, 2987
Hospitals, 668, qu. 812. *See also that title*
Brant, closing, 1995, 4075, 4303
Euclid Hall, Toronto, closing, 4075, 4303
Imperial and foreign soldiers, treatment, 691
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Joint industrial council, 1654
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 677, 696
Medical treatment and examination, 670, 687
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 670, 708, 2013
North Essex election, 2013
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pay and allowances, 687
Pensions, 3707. *See also that title*
European war and active militia. 2166. *See also* Pensions; Returned Soldiers
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Toronto Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Mrs. Van Koughnet, 4726
Training, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 1681, 2168
Vancouver office, appointments and dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Vocational loans, 687

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department Act Amdt. Bill
(Review and appeal tribunals; official soldier advisers; evidence on oath)
Res. 3648, 3745; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3892; 3r., 3895; Senate amendments, 4750
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, review and appeal tribunals, 3892
Official soldier advisers, 3894
Power to take evidence on oath, 3895
Regulations, medical and appeal boards, 3892

Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, qu. 3506, 3507, 4725

Solicitor General. *See* Justice

Sorel
Postmaster, appointment of, qu. 1487

Sorel—*Con.*
Shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344, 3374
Maintenance and operation, 3374

Souris, Man., public building, 4614

South Africa
Immigration policy, 1474, 1882
Senate, constitution, 1370

South America
Senates, constitution, 1373
Steamship service, 3377

Southampton, Ont. breakwater, 984

Soviet. *See* Russia

Spain
Senate, constitution, 1373
Trade with, 2397
Treaty with France, 2219

Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial forest patrol, 1776

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of:
Acoustics of chamber, 4594
Adjournment
To await action of Senate, 4754
To discuss, etc., 1540, 2886
Against rule, unless urgent, 3589-90, 4441
Debate to be confined to matter at issue, 3599, 3601
Must not revive former discussion, 4296
No right of reply, 3595, 3603
Except by consent, 2896
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Baker memorial, Joint commttee, 730
Bills
Drafting by law officers of House 494
First reading, explanation brief, 487
Not alterable except by authority of House, 3326
Reference to Private Bills Com. 4308
Second reading
More elaborate explanation, 487
Notice in writing, 3399
Principle only to be discussed, 3091
Third reading by consent, 4141
Time fixed for consideration, 4236
To be preceded by res. 4248
Trade, 331
Urgent and pressing, 4392

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Business of the House, to-morrow, 3750
Chair to be addressed, 2921
Committees
Discussion of questions not referred, 3267, 3270
M. for not debatable, 4013
M. to print proceedings, 3399
Notice of motion to go into, 3582-3
Reference in anticipation of report, 3574-6
Reports, concurrence by unanimous consent, 1739, 1991
Special
Appointment, two days notice necessary, 572
Membership limited to fifteen, 937
Redistribution bill, reference, 488
Consent, unanimous, 3326
Conversation, 1872
Debate
Anticipated or repeated, 1271, 3326-30
Closed if mover answers question, 2523
Decorum, 406
Irregular, 1668
Matters under consideration by committees, 2930
Member
May not speak without consent after mover has closed, 1080
Must address Chair, 2921
Mover closes, 393, 421, 568, 1210, 2523, 4474
Notice of M. to go into com. 3582, 3583
Peace and tranquillity, 3557
Previous, references to, 1687
Reference should be in third person, 2921
Relevancy, 3327
Debates, official report of, bulky returns, 940
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338
Industrial group of Great Britain, message, 4436
Interruptions, 323, 406, 3557
Only by consent, member speaking, 3518, 3587
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Staff, 2691
Organization, 4592
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., letter from Mrs. Kennedy acknowledging sympathy, 281
King, His Majesty the, introduction of name in debate, 728

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281
Language
"False" 3269
"Unmannerly" 3269
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation, anticipating, 667
Letters, reading, 2181
Library of Parliament, 2693
Members
May ask further question on orders of day by leave, 287
May not anticipate report of com, 3574-6
May speak only once, 2r. of bill, 273, 277
Moving res. exhausts right to speak, 1210
Must address Chair, 2921
Must not impute motives, 2573
New, introduced, 2837
Recognition of by Speaker, 1159
Referring to another, must use third person, 2921
Right of reply, 2896
Right to speak, 3589
Sitting may not interrupt without consent, 1546-9, 1996
To be fair to member speaking, 1155
Minister of National Defence, correct title, 495
Moose Jaw controverted election, 515, 615
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Motions
Adjournment to discuss. *See under this title,* Adjournment
Amendments
Expanded negative, 3521
To be consistent with principle involved, 643
Anticipatory, 3267, 3326, 3870
Changing membership, special com., 2417
Debate closed, member may not speak without consent, 1080
Dropped, 3264
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 341-42
Mover
Closes debate, 277, 393. *See also under this title,* Debate
Has no right to amend, 1528
Leave to withdraw, 1911
Right to speak exhausted, 1210
Non-debatable
For Com. of Whole, 4013, 4185
That Speaker leave chair, 3185, 4013, 4076

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Non-debatable—*Con.*
That com., rise, 4185
When made by consent, 3326
Notice, 4295
In writing, 3399
Not given, M. must stand, 3084
Not in writing, put by consent, 1538
Not substantive, no right of reply, 3595
Objection, too late, 3981
Questions sub judice, not debatable, 1284, 1307, 1912
Redrafting, 816
Seconder, 1308
Special order, 3271
Sub-amendments, 3573
Substantive, right to reply, 2896, 3595, 3603
Unanimous consent, 345, 435, 572, 1739, 2047, 2639
When vote is taken, Speaker bound to read, 3580
Newspaper articles
Irrelevant, 4143
Reflecting on House, 4142
Orders of the day
Debate not permissable, 859, 3650, 4441
Members speaking twice, 3401
Press statements not to be quoted but synopsized, 667
Questions permissible but not debate, 734, 1309, 1925, 2898, 3400-01
Order paper
Errors, 487, 519, 4437, 4457
Not available on account of long sitting, 4744
Petitions
Irregular, 2885
Presentation by unanimous consent, 4525
Point of order, member speaking to, 322
Privilege, questions of
Committees, discussion of questions not referred, 3267
Contradiction of members' statements from outside, 3649
Matter properly before House, 3268
Remarks out of order, 709
Statement by consent only, 708
Questions
Allowed only by consent of member having floor, 212
Already answered, 2419, 2795
Answered by member speaking, 2523
Answered verbally to be preceded by asterisk, 3506

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Asking, does not exhaust members' right to speak, 3589
Cost of living (Mr. Church) out of order, 3704
Excessive length, 622
Oral, without notice, 734
Orders of the day on, 734
Passed as orders for returns, 344, 939, 1139, 1386
Sub-judice, 1912
To be asked in third person, 3589
Railway Commission, appeal from, 1284, 1912
Relevancy, 309, 427, 1553, 3557
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Every member entitled to copy of, 940
Royal assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755
Rules of the House, 3330
Rule 17A, debatable motions, 3583, 4014
Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Rule 115, urgent and pressing, 4308, 4392
Special com. on, 1299
Rulings
Appeals from, 4076
Senate amendments, 4592
Senate and House of Commons Joint Com. 2611
Sitting
Hour of, opening day of session, 1
Wednesday, unanimous consent, 99
Statements, indirect presentation of, 3649
Stewart, late Hon. J. A., letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435
Supply, M. for, Rule 17C, 2640
Vacancies, 1763. *See also under this title,* Moose Jaw
Nicolet, 2178
Vimy Ridge Memorial
Letter from President of French Republic, 1538
Message from Governor General, 1631
Vote
May be taken if wish of House that Speaker do now leave chair, 4014
Method of taking, 434
Ways and Means Com., rule 17C, 2640

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Agricultural Conditions Com., report, printing, 2181
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4017
Charters, extension for one year, amdt. 4014

Speakman, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Business of the House
M. to adjourn, 3584
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com. 1302
Calgary customs warehouse, 1023
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 639
Credits
Rural, 639
System, 1252
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Economic conditions, 1250
Emigration to United States, 1253
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Hebridean immigrants, 3252
Treatment of, M. 3584
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Immigration
Hebridean, 3252, 3584
Policy, 1250
Selected, 1254
Soldier Settlement Board, 1255
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Institutionalism, excessive, 1251
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Party system of government, 1254
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703
Protection, suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Public buildings and local improvement taxes, 1022-3
Railway mail service, 1804
Railway rates, equalization, 1252
M. (Mr. Clark) 1966
Redistributon, 4741
Roads and bridges, 1014
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
St. John quarantine building, 4614
Sales tax, consumer and, 4423
School lands, purchase price, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed, purity of, 601
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, 2022-25
Steamship services, 2173
Tariff, more equitable to producers, 1252
Western provinces, conditions in, 1250
Winter trips, California, 1252

Special Delivery Letters. *See* Post Office

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Res. 2656, 3181, 3922, amended 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Books, failure or refusal to keep, 4434
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 2656, 3938
Cheque tax, 2656, 4363, 4409
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 3933; neg. 3934
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3934, ruled out of order, 3935
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 3935, ruled out of order, 3936
Limitation of maximum, 3922
Confectionery and beverages, 2656, 3046, 3938
Duty paid value, definition, 4425
Excise stamp taxes, payment with postage stamps, 3938, 4435
Receipt tax, 2656, 4409
Exemption, 4423
Sales tax, 4181, 4409, 4425
Collection at source, 2656, 3938, 4411
Exports, 4364, 4418
Government or provincial sales, 4435
Imports, 4409, 4417
Licensed manufacturer, 4410
Producer or, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4414-21
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 245, 915
Refund
Goods sold to provinces, 4435
To licensed manufacturers, 4418
Tinplate, 4418
Wholesale or jobber, 4410
Wines, excise tax on, 2656, 3937, 4425

Spectacle and Eyeglass Frames, 2653

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address; Governor General

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Audibility of debate,4572
Budget, 2976. Erratic and wasteful discussions; a business man's standpoint; amendment, 2976; tariff reduction and free trade; reciprocity; protection for tiller of the soil; oleomargarine duty; western conditions; "calamity howling"; secession talk, 2977; comparison of present and past conditions; improvement in agricultural position; cold storage, federal and provincial encouragement and assistance, 2978; St. Lawrence river waterway; water transportation; Welland canal; government by committee; avoidance of responsibility; committees of the

Spence, Mr. David—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
House, cost of; redistribution; soft drinks, tax on; cigarette duty; income tax penalties; Post Office department; postage stamps, use for special war revenue purposes; cheque tax; sales tax; newsprint; duty-free goods; banana trust; fruit, competition of foreign fruits; importation of, 2979; tariff commission; potato duty, 2980
Canadian National Railways, hotels, manager, qu. 1257
Cold storage, 187, 2978
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 275-6
Experimental farms, 472, 473
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2200
Mediterranean steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636
Military expenditure, 876
Nova Scotia wharves, expenditure, 4572
Toronto
Customs house, 3282
Harbour improvements, 986
Viaduct and union station, 4449

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Alberta
Destitution, 1440
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
United Farmers of, 1440
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4057, 4083-4102
Bankruptcy Act administration, 780
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Canada Grain Act, administration, 782
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Central experimental farm, building, 4631
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 634, 635
Amdt. to extend bank charters for twelve months, 638
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4199, 4323
Toronto office building, qu. 814
Davidson commission, war contracts, qu. 812
Emigration to United States, 1439
Freight rates and, 1440
Flax, cultivation of, 4378
Hebridean immigrants, 4706
Hector celebration, 4706
Immigration
Advertising, 1084
Canada Colonization Association, 1439
Grant, 1092
Estimates, amdt. to reduce, 1441

Spencer, Mr. Henry E.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Organizations asking for increased, 1111
Policy, 1438
Population, loss of, 1439
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Income tax collections, western provinces, qu. 2206
Industrial disputes, settlement of, 1705
Interest rates in West, 1440
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Justice, administration of, 4674
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003
Live stock condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Mixed farming, 2773
Naturalization, mounted police and, 779
Old age pensions, 1649
Oliver-St. Paul branch railway, 4323
Opium and narcotic drugs, 700
Peace river district, railways, 1440
Public works, surveys, 1020
Railway construction, 1440
Rural mail, western provinces, 1802
Scales, inspection of, 810
Taxation, indirect, 1440, 3027
Toronto seed branch building, 4627
Vermilion town lots
Purchase, qu. 489, 1307
Rental, qu. 2417
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 656
Western provinces, conditions, 1439
Wrecks, investigation, 3160

Spirituous Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Sponagle, Col. J. A., port physician, Margaretville, N. S. qu. 2697

Sporting Mountain mail service. *See* Post Office

Spray Lakes lease. *See* Calgary Power Company

Spruce Bud Worm. *See* Forests and Forestry

Stability. *See* Tariff

Stamps. *See* Post Office; Taxation

Standard Shipping Company. *See* Freight Rates
Standard of Living, 1168. *See also* Cost of Living; Immigration
Standard Oil Company
Dividends, 2601

Standard Oil Company—*Con.*
Prosecution and fines, 2585

Standardization. *See* Agricultural Implements

Standards
Bureau of, 788
Canadian Engineering Association, 788

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Agricultural conditions, 1846, 3064
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Budget, 3062. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3062; sales tax, exemption drain tiles; cheque tax; stamp tax, notes and cheques; tariff policy of Conservative party; "out-Heroding Herod"; stability; definition of protection tariff and tariff for revenue, 3063; new Liberal doctrines; source in Montreal; failure of budget to balance; expenditure, increase of; expenditure and debt reduction; agriculture; condition of; speech of Minister of Agriculture; accredited herd system, 3064; tuberculin test; agriculture, needs of; sympathetic consideration of other interests; extreme attitude of Progressives; spirit of compromise; sacrifice, 3065; farmers and the tariff; provision for long-term loans; market facilities; Liberal party and tariff; failure to implement pledges; tariff reduction offset by increase in sales tax, 3066; disappointment of Progressive party; National Policy; problems of East and West, 3067
Cadet services, 878
Dairying industry, 1846
Emigration to United States, 1414
Farm mortgages, 1846
Immigration
Policy, 1412
Progressive party and, 1413
Ministers' and officials' travels, qu. 283, qu. 343
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3558
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1787
Sales tax, drain tiles, 3046, 3063
Tariff, immigration and, 1413
Western provinces, conditions in, 1415

Stationery. *See* Printing Bureau

Statistics. *See also* Immigration; Population; Trade

Statistics—*Con.*
Census figures, 43
Dominion bureau of, 788, 2032, 2034
Annual report tabled, 1539
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Staff
Temporary employees, qu, 938
Transfer from Labour dept, 1671, 2032
International labour office, 1631
Production, statement of, 2720
Wealth of Canada, estimated, 2719

Statutes, Quebec provincial, 1660

Steamship Combines. *See* Agricultural Conditions Com. report; Combines; Freight Rates, Shipping

Steamship Companies. *See also* Steamship Services
Immigration, 1201, 1462

Steamship Services, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Trade and Commerce
Advertisement for tenders, 3382-3
Canada-Great Britain, qu. 937
Canada-Newfoundland, 2171, 3377
Canada-West Indies, qu. 937, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Charlottetown-Pictou, 2171
Extension to Great Lakes suggested, 2175
Freight rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Control of, 2174
Railway commission and, 4003
Grand Manan and mainland, 2172
Halifax-Louisburg-St. Lawrence, 4701
Halifax-Newfoundland, 2173
Halifax-West Coast-Cape Breton, 2173
Inspection of, 2178
Mail carriage, 2172
Mainland and islands of Miscou-Shippegan, 2173
Mediterranean to, qu. 1488, 1636
Mulgrave-Canso, 2173
Mulgrave-Guysboro, 2173
Pelee island and mainland, 2174
Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish, 2174
Pictou-Souris-Magdalen islands, 2174
Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or ports, 2174
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Quebec or Montreal and Gaspe, 2176
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 2176, 4004
St. John-Bear River, 2176
St. John-Digby, 2176
St. John-Westport-Yarmouth, 2176

Steamship Services—*Con.*
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2178
Tariff and, 2923
Vancouver ports on Howe island, 4003
Vancouver-Northern ports British Columbia, 4003
Victoria-West coast Vancouver island, 4003

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2835. Congratulations to Finance Minister; protective tariff, little relief; protected interests, nothing to fear; disappointment and discontent in West; agricultural conditions; cost of living and production; prices of farm products; lack of purchasing power; cost of transportation and distribution, 2835; Crowsnest pass agreement; Wheat Board; Manitoba legislature, attitude of; royal commission on freight rates and grain trade; rural credits and farm loans; natural resources; municipal taxation, prices in Canada and United States; tariff and prices; agricultural implements; protection unsound; revenue; direct taxation, 2836; inheritance tax; graduated income tax; amendment
Experimental farms, 469
Lake Killarney improvement, 999
Live stock industry, 468
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1146
Seed inspection, 198
Taxation, direct, 2836
Turtle Mountain reserve, reforestation, 3413

Steel, the L. R. Company, Limited, qu. 1994

Steel. *See* Iron and Steel

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjammer
Coal resources of Hudson bay, 1073
Reindeer and muskox in Barren Lands, 1073

Stenographers, members' qu. 518

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Australia, trade treaty with, 1848
Bank Act, reference to speech on, 4031-4
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4032, 4081, 4089, 4099, 4125
Bank of Vancouver, qu. 4011
Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, 816
British Columbia
Claims against federal government, 708
Liquor. *See under this title* Canada Temperance; Liquor
Oil companies, 2505

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3454
Goods imported via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454
Bureau of Standards, 788
Business of the House, private bills, posting, 4248
Canada Highways bill, 2338
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, coasting regulations, 4235
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2407-13, 2424. *Se also under this title,* Liquor Act of 1922, 2407
Correspondence with Attorney General, British Columbia, 1032-38
Exceptions, 2409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Expenditure and earnings, 1868
Vessels, earnings, 3324, 3399
Canadian National Railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3610
M. to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4341
Appropriations, 4342
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Management, responsibility and powers, 3628
Paris offices, 3618, 3627, 3681
Amdt. that item stand, 3664; ruled out of order, 3667
Ruling, reference to, 3670
Securities, 4525
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2308-37, 4537
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 204
Combines bill, 2524
Combines Investigation Act, 1910, prosecutions, 2575
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4208-4217
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Corruption-liquor purchases, 2410
Customs duty, goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 3272
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4265, 4344
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Homesteads, 4201
Pulpwood, permission to cut, 4206
Estimates, civil government, form of, 612, 780

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Exchequer court judgeship, 2500
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4541
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
Freight rates
Railway Act Amdt bill, 54
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1940
French treaty
Canned salmon, Japanese packed, 453
Favoured nation, 448
Fuel supply, 793
Geological survey, 2504
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 322
Grain and grain trade, 3821
Elevators
Dockages, qu. 1484, qu. 1661
Earnings, 2042
Overages, 2043
Screenings, 2041, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Revenue from, 2042
Grain Act, licenses, 2299
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 293, 304, 305
Shipment and handling, 2044
Granville island, taxation, qu. 1485
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Nova Scotia, 941
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Quebec, 950
Highway construction grants, 623
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 513
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1315
Endorsation of Imperial government and railways, 1328
Chinese, 2311-12. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
Lands
Orientals to, 511
Thirty-two year agreements for sale, 1317
Policy, 1315
Taxation and emigration, 1319
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 511, 857
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495-98
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians, 2124-5
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Interest rate, 4110
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2138

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron ore deposits, British Columbia, 2505
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4281
Lake of the Woods
Control board, expenses, 4001
Regulation bill, 4173-75
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia
Administration, 2410, 2424
Bootlegging
Attorney General and, 2407
Execution of murderers of policeman Lawson, 2407
Export, 2407
Warehouses, 3144
National railways, transportation on, 3324
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3256
Marine hospitals, 701
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, trip to Great Britain, 3290
Masters and mates, 2610
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2114-23
National Defence, pay of staff, 891
New York, appointment Canadian customs officer, 3272
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4484
Officers, military, retired, 891
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Ordnance lands, 3444
Ore-testing plants, 2506
Ostrea lake wharf, 943
Patents of Invention bill, 2066-77-87, 2131
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
Domicile, election of, 2070
Pensions
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 4248
Point Grey sandhead leases, 3671
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., report, 248
Prince Rupert civic employees, 2086
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 416
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 951
Public Works, estimates, explanation, 961
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2500-02
Purchasing Commission, 4002
Renovated butter, 4265 ,4344
Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Pensions, inadequacy, 774, qu. 1362
Scrip, qu. 1362
Sales tax, 4181, 4429, 4431
Drain tiles, 3183
Exemptions, 4431
M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Nursery stock, 4432
Tomato plants, 4432
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4241
Settlers' relief, 3448
Special War Revenue Act, M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Sponagle, Col. J. A., qu. 2697
Steamship services, 2171
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Terminal elevators and grain trade, 3821
Timber permits, qu. 203
Trade commissioners, 1847
Unemployment, order in council No. 220, 436
Vancouver harbour bill, 255-9
Vancouver harbour board, 387
Venereal diseases, 705
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
War claims, amdt. to reduce, 2502
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085

Stevenson, Mr. John A., article on immigration, 628

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Minister of Mines; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Agriculture, depressed condition, 1083
Alberta Liberal convention, 2995, 2797
Alpine Club grant, 3414
Arctic explorations, 3944
New ship for, 4702
Banff National park, water powers, 3420, 3939
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 3412
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509-12, 3206. *See also under this title,* Fuel
British Empire exhibition, 1910
Appropriation, 3950
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 4704
Budget, 2795. Tribute to Finance Minister, 2795; science of government; responsibilities and difficulties; promise and performance; tariff reduction; war debt, expenditure and taxation, 2796; inflation; agricultural conditions; depression of 1890-96; extravagance, ex-

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
penditure and debt; per capita debt; natural resources, 2797; protection of industries; artificial silk; business depression, 2798; changes of government in Alberta and Manitoba; tariff reduction not warranted; difficulties due to other causes; world competition; moving in direction of tariff reduction; tariff stability does not mean finality, 2799; immigration; freight rates; railway labour, wages; deflation; emigration; co-ordination of immigration work; land settlement; unemployment, 2800; labour; unemployment; co-operation of government with railway companies; agricultural conditions in United States; immigration from United States; taxation, apportionment of; taxation of capital, 2801; necessary to attract capital as well as labour; natural resources, development of; mineral wealth, conservation of; coal and oil production; inheritance tax; balanced budget; railway debt and deficits; revenue from coal and oil in Alberta, 2802; amendment; income tax; land tax; inheritance tax; agriculture, condition and prospects, 2803
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3435-39, 4702
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Calgary Power Company, application, 3939-40
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2413
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands
Automobile admission fee, 3942
Water powers, leases, 3420, 3442, 3939
Cattle embargo, effect of removal, 1101
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 768, 2308-2337, 2481, 4536. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Children, 2484
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Merchants, 2482
Students, 2317
Wives, 2484
Civil Service Commission, appointments, 1086
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Alberta
Freight rates on, 1269

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Alberta—*Con.*
Production and revenue, 2802
Shipments to Ontario, 1163
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Hudson's Hope, 3203
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Commodity and agricultural products, prices, 1083
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Deflation, inequality of, 1407
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks bill, 1256, 2060-86
Dominion lands
Contingencies, 3408
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, 1354
Reclamation by drainage, 3430
Dominion Lands Act, Amdt. bills
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Homesteads, 3982, 4201, 4364
Second, 3398
Dominion lands and parks, 3249. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Estimates, 3406
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion Power board, 3427
Emigration to United States, 1082-93, 1322-30
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Exhibitions, 1454
British Empire, 1910, 3950, 4704
Exhibits for, 1468-9
Expenditure, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Staff and salaries, 1455-65
United States in, 1465
Farmers' credits, 1088
Forest protection, 3409-20
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
Freight rates, 2799
Reduction of, 1101
Fuel Supply. *See also under this title,* Coal
Coal prices, control of, 3198
Coke ovens, 789
Fuel testing, 789
M. (Mr. Church) 1269-81
Peat experiments, 790, 3199, 3206
United States, 3203
Geodetic survey, estimates, 3245
Geological survey, estimates, 2504, 3197
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Grain, marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 309
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Grazing leases, 3426
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3591
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 503
Historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939
Fort Edward, 3432-5
Homesteads. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Improvements, 3251
Inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3227
Howat, Mr. Alex., detention at border, 2297, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3159
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4687
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3203
Immigration, 2800. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Advertising, 1103, 1218
Alleged campaign against, 332
British Columbia, 1327, 1096
Canada Colonization Association, 1089, 1386, 1479, 1877
Agreement, signing, 1976
Terms, 1102, 1320
Endorsation of Imperial Govt. and railways, 1328
History, 1102
Minister's statement, 1089
Further statement, 1320
Officers, 1172
Directors and, 1327
Proposals of, memo, 1877
Railway contributions, 3400
Reorganization, 3400
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1164, 1323, 1328, 1429
Child, 1099, 1469
Agencies, 1470
Domestic servants, conductresses, 1477-8
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 688, 1096, 1464, 1469, 1473, 1480
Grant, division of, 1475
European, 1170, 1316
Farm labourers, 1100
Winnipeg, 1976
Foster homes for children, 1099
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Great Britain, from, 1084, 1346
Officers in, 1879
Hebridean, 3591
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Interest rates on land purchases, 1088
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Leased land for American settlers, 1101
Literature, 1428
Maritime provinces, 1086

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Minister's statement, 1082
Movement of population to United States, 1082
New Brunswick, 1200
Nominative system, 1360, 1478
Norway and Sweden, from, 1192
Ontario, 1085
London office, 1428
Oriental
Chinese, 1443. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission of, 1446
Children, 1445
Estimates, 1443
Legislation, forecast of, 502
Japanese
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1454
Passages
Assisted, from Great Britain, 1100
Immigrant's family or friends, 1100
Loans, 1475
Prepaid, agreement with Imperial government, 2611
Policy, 1317, 1386
Propaganda embracing all Canada, 1098
Provincial government and, 1327
Publicity work, 1874
Quebec, 1085, 1104
Restriction of, 1170
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Agreement with Canadian Pacific, 1458
Scotland from, 1095
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Statistics, 1881-1922, 1094
Swedish representative, visit of, 1095, 1192
Ukrainians, 1397
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1093
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 502, 514
Immigration and Colonization dept.
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 1476, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1110, 1317, 1386
Details of, 1482
Ingram, Mr., appointment of, 2664
May, Mr., appointment of, 2663
Outside service, salaries, 1082
Salaries and contingencies, 1873, 1909
Indians, 2124
Agents, 2146
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, appointment of, 2151
New Brunswick, 2154

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
British Columbia, 2163
Cattle, beef production, 2159, 2162
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2126
Education, 2126
Appropriations for, 2164
Increased, 2145
Church organizations, work of, 2146
Edmonton school, 2149-2165
Morley reserve, 2150
Farming, 2156
Greater production, 2155
Indian Affairs, dept
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2153, 2165, 4702
Reorganization, 2162
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Medical service, 2160
Minister, statement of, 2145
Northern Ontario and Manitoba, hunting grounds, 2146
Nova Scotia, 4702
Potlatching, 2163
Reserves
Blackfeet, 2148-9
Caughnawaga, expulsion of halfbreeds, 2163
Grain production, 2156
Highways, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Hay, 2153
St. Lawrence river islands, 2164
Sioux, 2160
Treatment of, 2158
Tuberculosis, 2153
Interior, dept. of
Estimates, 1904, 3406, 3939, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, surveys, etc. 3246
Iron ore
Alberta, 2512
British Columbia, 2505, 2514
Reported discovery, lake Athabasca, 2513
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 1992, 2138, 2204, 2428-36, 2668-71, 3981
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Cheap, 1118
Delegates from United States, detention *See under this title,* Howat
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Labrador gold discovery, reported, 2611
Gold rush, 1995
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 238

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4172
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands; Immigration
American immigrants, for, 1093
Free, available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Speculation, 1395
Taxation of, 1105
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1213, 1309
Liberal platform of 1919, 2994
Lignite Utilization Board, 2515. *See also under this title,* Bienfait
Live stock prices in West, 1101
Mackenzie river district, halfbreed claims, 3409, 3444
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Maps, preparation of, 3443
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention, 2469. *See also under this title,* Howat
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Military hospitals, mental cases, 671
Mines department
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Salaries, 3207
Moose Mountain pleasure resort, 3408
National Parks and Reservations bill, 3131
Northwest territories
Administration, 3944, 4702
New ship, purchase and maintenance, 4702
Wireless telegraph system, 3944, 3948
Oil, 2802
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, 2508
Fuel, shale deposits, 2513
Oil companies, British Columbia, 2505
Southern Alberta, 2508
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Ore-testing
British Columbia, plants, 2506
Machinery, 2509
Shipment to Ottawa, 2505
Peat. *See under this title,* Fuel
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Promissory notes, tax, 3924
Publicity agent in London, 4707
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3406
Reforestation, Turtle mountain reserve, 3413
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3427
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
School lands. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4203
Seed grain advances, 3444, 4367

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board
Advances and salaries, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Estimates, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2018
Land sales, supervisors, alleged attempt to bribe, 1092
Legal expenses, 2018, 2020
Loans, 2028
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3245
Towers, 2512
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Water powers
Administration of, 3420
Banff National park, 3420, 3939
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Highwood river, 3427
Leases, 3422
Provincial jurisdiction, 3421
Publicity, 3421
Wheat, price of, 1101
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Mining fees, 1636

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Branch lines, construction bill, 4311-22
Cheque tax, 3934
Destructive insect pests, 597
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1060
Income tax, fines, remissions, 3507
Labour, department
Annuities branch, 1677
Staff, 1677
Merchants' Bank inquiry, 3990
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2459, 3984
Noxious weeds, 2305
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1834
Penitentiaries, 771
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833
Seed testing bill, 2305
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4311, 4315, 4322
Weights and measures, Peterborough, 810

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Address in reply, 169. Near East crisis, 169; increase in commerce; trade conventions; removal of cattle embargo; immigration; Bank Act revision, 170; shipping rates combine inquiry; re-

Stewart, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
distribution; proportional representation, 171; Mr. Hoey's reference to Mr. Meighen, 171-172; Conservative party not dead or sleeping, 172
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1527
Brockville rifle range, 889
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, lease of freighters, 3848
Canadian National railways, ties, qu. 516
Cornwall canal employees, qu. 3135
Hudson Bay railway, 4684
Immigration, medical inspection, 703
Income tax convictions, qu. 3582
Labour, jurisdiction, 1650
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrisburg-Waddington ferry, qu. 1029
Murray Stewart, steamer, qu. 386
National monument, Connaught place, 2685-88
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2439-40
Old age annuities, 1639
Peat experiments, 3206
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Rideau canal, water power leases, qu. 622
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Troops for Sydney strike, qu. 624

Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5, 7, 8, 166
Letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435

Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. Dan W., qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton)
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976

Stipendiary Magistrates. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Rocky Mountain park, 1739

Stock. *See* Live Stock

Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stornoway. *See also* Hebridens
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speech, 2181

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 149. Skeena pioneer constituency, 149-50; Yukon telegraph lines; Queen Charlotte islands, 150; natural resources of Skeena; halibut fisheries;

Stork, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Prince Rupert port, 151; railway traffic; visit of Montreal Board of Trade, 152; Grand Trunk Pacific, 153
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Budget, 2733. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity, reception of announcement in Canada and United States; Chicago Tribune, comment; sugar, 2733; sales tax; copper bounty; machinery for manufacture of fish offal; British preference; direct importation; Canadian ports; Prince Rupert; reciprocity campaign in 1911; Fordney tariff, 2734; fishing industry and United States markets; use of Canadian ports by United States fishermen; collection of duty on purchases in Canada; United States wharf on Canadian soil; Canadian representative at Washington, 2375
Labour, right to organize, 2888
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2460
Orientals, 2461
Powell River Paper Company, 2888

Strikes. *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour

Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Students. *See also* Schools; Universities
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Medical, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Federation of Canadian students, res. 2486

Stumping Machines. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Sub-Judice Questions. *See* Speaker

Subsidies. *See* Bounties; Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dry Dock Subsidies Act; Steamship Services

Suez Canal, Goods imported via Hong Kong 3454

Sugar. *See also* Budget; Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Beet, excise duty, abolition of, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393
British preference, 2651
British tax on, 2754
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Combine, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Women and, 2576
Customs drawbacks, 2655, 3502

Sugar—*Con.*
Customs duty, 2820, 2825, 2981, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3060, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping clause, 2646, 3046
Reduction of, 2645, 2646, 2744, 2968, 3049
Refiners' protection, 2987
Gambling in, 3058
Jam manufacturers, 3477
Price, increase of, 2646, 2734, 2889, 2933

Sullivan, Mr. Arthur W., 381

Superannuation. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities, Civil Service; Judges; Pensions

Supplementary Estimates. *See* Estimates

Supreme Court, general rules and orders, 1659

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 456, 575, 668, 859, 941, 993, 1082, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1538, 1619, 1637, 1668, 1694, 1740, 1764, 1811, 1837, 1873, 2017, 2124, 2145, 2392, 2489, 2494, 2610, 2671, 3160, 3272, 3330, 3406, 3610, 3706, 3760, 3798, 3824, 3830, 3938, 3985, 4554, 4594, 4638

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 4732, 4735
Estimates. *See that title*
Subjects and items discussed:
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Cattle
Shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Embargo, expenses, 3989
Dairying, 609, 3283
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 595, 3988
Experimental farms, 456
Fruit, 598
Health of animals, 575, 587, 3989, 4675
International Institute of, 599
Publications, 598
Salaries and contingencies, 610, 3303, 4674
Stockgrowers' Protective Association grant, 587
Suppression of foul brood in bees, 4675
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Auditor General, 3897, 4003

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Air Force. *See under this title,* National Defence
Annuities. *See under this title,* Labour
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4676. *See also under this title,* Insulin
British and Foreign news service, 4712
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 4708
Business Profits War Tax Act, 3949
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 2035, 4709
Canada Highways Commission, 2489, 3173
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Athletic Team, Olympic games, 4706
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788
Canadian Forestry Association, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3798, 3824-30
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3938, 3948,
Canadian National Railways, 1764
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3676, 3789
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 3376
$ 1,700,000, 3376
$ 1,550,000, 4692
Branch lines, purchase of, 3646
Peace river railway survey, 4698
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Transcontinental, Fortin & Moffat claim 3646
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Canadian representative in United States, 4001
Canadian Press, Limited, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727
Canals. *See also under this title,* Railways and Canals
Isle Perrot bridge, St. Anne's lock, 3646
Rideau, 4691
Trent, improvement, 3647, 4691
Welland, construction, 3760, 4690
Chief electoral officer, 4001
Civil Service
Bonus, 1664, 1811
Commission, salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Commissioner of Taxation, 3949
Customs and Excise, 3272
Debates, Official Report of, 2691

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4667
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion lands and parks, 3406, 3938, 4702
Dominion lands, contingencies, 3408
Outside service, salaries, 3249
Dominion Power Board, expenses, 3427
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Empire Forestry Convention, 3410
Exhibitions, 1910, 1454
British Empire, 3949, 4704
Canadian traveling exhibition in France, 811, 4711
External Affairs, salaries, 3987
Finance, charges of management, 3987
Fuel supply
Advisory fuel committee, 4691
Fuel and power resources, investigation, 3427
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey, 2504
Government publications, 1712
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Gratuities to Grand Trunk officials, 1664
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Harbours and rivers, 941, 993
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 1002, 2671
Manitoba, 993, 4589
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
St. John, 2676, 4610
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4722
Ontario, 981, 2690, 4588, 4594
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675, 4610
Toronto harbour improvements, 2678, 4610
Prince Edward island, 945, 4586
Quebec, 950, 4588
Champlain dock, 2675
Health, department of, 697, 2167
Marine hospitals, 701
Medical examination of immigrants, 702
Medical research laboratories, 703
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Hector celebration, 4705
Highways. *See under this title,* Canada Highways
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 4680

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Company, refund, 3647, 4686, 4689
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration and Colonization, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Imperial Conference, 4638
Imperial Economic Conference, 4638
Expenses of delegation, 4666
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3949
Indians, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Insulin, discovery and supply, 703
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interior, department, 4702
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, 4667
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dominion observatory, 3242
Engraving maps, etc., 3443
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3428
Ordnance lands, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage, 3430
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 1909, 3949
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Justice, department, 4667
Administration, 705, 4674
Bankruptcy Act, administration, 780
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Salaries, 780
Labour, 1621
Annuities Act, administration, 1639
Canada Gazette, 1707
Employment offices, 1630
Industrial Disputes Act, 1627, 1702, 1716
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Salaries, etc., 1668, 1694
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 4001
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, monument, 1017
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, Canadian delegates, 3989
Legislation
House of Commons, 4674
Committees, expenses, 2691, 4674
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Senate, salaries, etc. 2694, 3949
Library of Parliament, 2691
Lord Selkirk Association, grant, 4704

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Mackenzie river district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marine and Fisheries
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3364
Detroit river traffic regulation, 3357
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
False Creek bridge, 3375
Fish culture, 3367
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Fisheries protection service, 3361
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, salaries, 3351
Live Stock inspection, 3334
Maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, 3353
Marine biological board, 3371
Marine signal service, 3358
Meteorological service, 3360
Navigation
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Obstructions, navigable waters, 3332
Schools, 3331
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Maintenance of steamers, 3160
Wrecks, investigation, 3160, 3330
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
River St. Lawrence ship channel, 3375
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Sorel shipyard, 3343, 3374
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334
Merchants Bank inquiry, expenses, 3990
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Mines and Minerals
Assay office, Vancouver, 3207
Explosives division, 2514
Mines and Geological Survey, 2504, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
National Defence, 1740
Ammunition, 884
Annual drill, 4635
Arsenals
Lindsay, 803
Quebec, 884
Bonus, 1751, 1772
Cadet service, 877
Canadian air service, 1748, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Engineer services and works, 4638
Grants to associations, 889
May, Miss H. M., grant, 900
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia services, annual drill, 859
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
Northover, Major, H. R., 4635
Ordnance lands, arms, etc., 890
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Schools of instruction, 900
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1745
Warlike stores, 900
National Gallery of Canada, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020, 2685
Naturalization Act, administration, 2495
Northwest territories
Administration, wireless, etc., 3449, 3948
Wireless station, Mayo, 4702
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Paris agency, expenses, 4001
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Pensions
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3706
Fenian raid, 3742
Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 2168, 3742
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Post office
Mail service, 1778
Miscellaneous, 1832
Salaries and contingencies, 1814
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Printing, publications, 811
Printing bureau, 1710, 1730
Miscellaneous printing, 1716

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Public printing and stationery, retiring allowances, 3949
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, 1022
Archives, 1730
Law, late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Manitoba, 4628
Maritime provinces, 4614
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario, 1022, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, 1729
Architects, compensation, 4633
Parliament buildings, 1716
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Printing bureau, new building, 1730
Quebec, 4614
St. John immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021
Water supply, 1022
Saskatchewan, 4629
Terrebonne, Quebec, 2690
Public Works, 4594
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Graving docks, locks, etc. 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See under this title,* Harbours and Rivers
Roads and bridges, 1014, 4589
Salaries, 2684
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682, 4590
Pulpwood Commission, 4709
Purchases, government, supervision of, 3950, 4001
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, wireless stations, 3374
Railway Commissioners, Board of, 3188
Railways and Canals, 3650. *See also under this title,* Canals
Arbitration, litigation, etc. 3195
Contingencies, 3377
Intercolonial pension allowances, 3195
Printing and stationery, 3197
Prince Edward Island railway, pensions, 3195
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648, 4691
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, 1163
Royal Canadian Navy, 900-2

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374,
Surveys and investigations, 3647
Secretary of State
Public archives, 3985
Salaries, 2392, 2494
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board, 1910
Advances and salaries, 2017
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668, 4703
Department, salaries, 687
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 696
Medical examination of pensioners, 670
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pensions, European war and active militia, 2166
Sheltered employment, burial expenses, etc., 693
Treatment, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 2168
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701.
Topographical surveys, 3244
Trade and Commerce, 3377, 4701
Bounties, petroleum, 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171
Patent and Copyright branch, 2035
O'Halloran, Mr. G. F., salary increase, 4673
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Steamship services. *See under this title,* Steamship Services
Terminal elevators, maintenance, 810
Treaties, negotiation of, expenses, 3989
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Water powers, surveys, etc. 3420
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Yukon territory, government of, 3943

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic Survey; Water Powers
Base lines, townships, lakes, rivers, qu. 1866
Prairie provinces in, qu. 1866
Public works, 1020
Railway, 4691. *See also* Railways
Peace River district, 4698

Surveys—*Con.*
Topographical, 2509, 3244
Boundary posts and towers, 2512
Expenditure, qu. 1865

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agriculture department
Deputy minister's salary, 611
Estimates, 3284
Salaries and contingencies, 611
Agricultural conditions com. 3271
Agricultural instruction grant, 607-8
Administration, 3284
Agricultural products, imports, qu, 617, 1426
Alderson claim, 584
Ammunition, 887
Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426
Bacon, grades of, 593
Bayfield harbour, 981
Business of the House
Chair, ruling of, 4720
Questions passed as orders for returns, 940
Canada Grain Act, administration, 785
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3693
Cattle. *See also under this title,* Live Stock
Embargo, removal, correspondence, 4133
Shipment, 3317
Civil Service
Hours, 1427
Reduction of expenditure in Great Britain, 1803
Political partisanship, 286
Cold storage, 188
Warehouses, 191
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Dairying industry, 609
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Restrictions, 3153
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3153
M. to discharge order, 3325
Daylight saving, farmers and, 1427
Debates, official report of
Missing pages, 887-8, 1081
Supply, undiscussed items, 3292
Emigration to the United States, 1431
Exhibitions, 1468
Experimental farms, 464-486
Ontario, 465
Farm labour, 1427
Feeding stuffs
Adulteration, 604
Conference, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Halifax grain elevator, 4716
Hamilton-Brantford highway, 2494

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Health of animals, 584
Compensation for slaughter, 486
Hog grading, 593
Government publications, agriculture, 1428
Grain, dockage, 785
Group government, 1427
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1102, 1104, 1428, 1478
Financial support, 1429
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Child, 1472-5
Domestic servants, and, 1100
Empire settlement scheme, 1474
Literature, 1428
Ontario, 1098, 1428, 1475
Policy, 1425
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1630, 1716
Labour
Department, statistics, 1682, 1684
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Live stock. *See also* Cattle
Breeding at experimental farms, 465
Export trade, 193
Visit of Canadian commissioners to South America, 1213
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, qu. 384
Activities of, 3292, 3308
Address to South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Appointment, 3308
Order in council, 3294
Political patronage, 3316
Salary, 3286
Trips
Florida, 3309
Great Britain, 3308
Matane harbour improvements, 972
Mill feeds, adulteration, legislation, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs
National Defence, ammunition, 1744
Naval service, 909, 1744
Nova Scotia miners' strike, 84, 1716
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Butter and, 386
Manufacture of, 3153
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3575
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good), 3572
Ontario grain elevators, 4716-20
Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Order in council, P.C. 223, 815
Peat experiments, 790
Penitentiaries, 772
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Dredging, 1012
Post office
Political patronage, 3316
Rural mail delivery, 1803
Remuneration, competitive system, 1803
Privilege, Redistribution Com. 1660
Pulpwood, export, royal commission, 4709
Quebec arsenal, 887
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2975
Redistribution, special committee, 1660
Privilege, 1660
Report, 4740
Welland, Lincoln and Haldimand, 667
Sales tax, 1427
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 927
Tariff changes, 1427
Tuberculin test, 3302
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Warner, Mr., reference to, 1425

Swan, Mr. E. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Sweden
Immigration from, 1095, 1191, 1216
Senate, constitution of, 1373

Switzerland
French treaty, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Immigration, 3591
National Council, constitution of, 1373
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Trade with, 2397
Watches and clocks, imports from, 2214

Sydenham Hospital. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sydney Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2178

Taché, Mr. J. de L., General Librarian, Debates, missing pages, 1081

Taché, Sir E. P., Senate, elective, 1367

Tadoussac, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157

Tagore, Mr. Rabindranath, civilization, 2729

Talbot, Mr. Onésiphore. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Tampa Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Tank Cars, transportation of, qu. 1361

Tariff. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty; United States. *For items discussed see* Customs Tariff Items
Aggregate tax paid in 50 years, 2793
Agricultural implements, 2743, 2756, 2975. *See also that title*
Industry, cost per employee, 2975
Agricultural conditions and, 1355, 1907
All countries increasing, 2819
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Amdts. of Liberal opposition 1920 and 1921, 3020
Average rate, 22, 89, 2838
Bituminous coal, duty on, 1275-8
British preference. *See also that title*
Increase, 2718
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Budget of 1922, net increase of duty, 3034
Canada not self-contained country, 3061
Canadian and United States, duties, comparison, 2958. *See also* United States
Changes in, 2702, 2853, 3488, 3895
Date on which effective, 3504
Under pressure of organized effort, 1427
Class privilege, 2728, 3069, 3074
Combines and, 2533, 2586, 2714
Anti-combine clause, 2534
Reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561, 2583
Commission of 1920, 3028
Report voluminous, 3024, 3028
Conservative policy appropriated by Liberals, 2974
Consistency, 3072
Copper and creosoting industry, discrimination, 3231
Downward revision, 2786, 2831, 2945, 2907, 2968
Drawbacks, raw material, qu. 1864
Dumping clause, 2535, 3072
Duties, combines and, 2608
East and West, 2753
Economic warfare, 3053
Emigration and, 1093, 1440, 2737, 2823. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Equal to that of United States, 1246
Farmers, difficulties and, 2916, 3065
Favoured nation treatment. *See* Treaties, French, Italian
Finality, 2648, 2772, 2799, 2841, 2912, 3052. *See also under this title,* Stability
Fordney-McCumber. *See* United States
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519

Tariff—*Con.*
High, 2924, 2980
Revolt against, 1859
Home markets, 2849
Immigration, effect on, 1113-4, 1119, 1133, 1222, 1413, 1416, 1424. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Implements of production, reduction, 2718, 2858, 2951, 2955. *See also under this title,* Agricultural Implements
Industries and, 3024
Intermediate and preferential. *See* Treaties, French
Investigation of industries, 2955
"Invisible tariff" 3000
Issue from 1878 to 1896, 2974
Items. *See* Customs Tariff Items
"Jacking-up," 3074, 3907
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Laurier-Fielding, 3030
Liberal party and, 2221, 3008. *See also that title*
Budget, protective, 2818
Platform, 1919, 2872
Pledges, 2951, 2952, 2994
Policy, 3007
Liberal and Conservative parties 2854
Joint product of, 2852
Not much difference between, 3018
Limitation to tariff income and turnover, 2859
Lower, competition, 2861
Luxuries, 2015
Macdonald, Sir John, of, 2756
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufacturers and, 2812
Minimum, 440
Minister of Finance, attitude on, 2838
Moderate, 2856, 2857
More equitable to producers, 1252
National policy, 2786. *See also that title*
Necessaries of life, 2955
Reduction of duties, 2718
No relief from, 2835
No surrender of Canadian markets, 2746
Not political but economic question, 2818
Oleomargarine, 3529
Ontario and, 1240
Other matters of greater importance, 2959
Parliamentary committee, 3028
Patents, Trade Marks and Copyright Act, 2293, 2294
Per capita tax, 3026
Permanent tariff commission, 2754, 2980, 2955, 3028, 3069
Portage la Prairie, district board, res., 3039

Tariff—*Con.*
Preferential. *See* British Preference; Imperial Conference; Treaties, French, Italian
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Production costs, 1394
Progressive party and, 2745
Prohibitive, 2850
Prosperity and, 2398
Protection, 2787, 2854. *See also that title*
Revenue and, 2778, 2835, 2957, 3048, 3063
Public ownership, 2905
"Purely and simply protective", 2908
Railway deficit and, 2905
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
Reciprocity, 3080. *See also that title*
Reductions, 38, 100, 1420, 2813, 2944, 2972, 2976, 3048, 3066, 3077, 3082
Liberal party and, 2847
Recent, 3010
Resolutions, 2650, 3454, 3895, 3963
Changes in, 3046, 3082
McMaster, Mr., free food and implements of production, 2996
Revenue, 2839, 2850, 2854, 2905, 3063, 3069
"Same old", 2981
"Say-so" of beneficiaries, 2956
"Scientific" 3069
Seward, late William Henry, speech, 2916
Special committee, 2955
Special privileges, 2786
Specific duties, 2215
Stability, 2648, 2657, 2703, 2717, 2718, 2741, 2755, 2772, 2775, 2787, 2799, 2806, 2809, 2819, 2835, 2841, 2853, 2912, 2966, 3011, 3028, 3052, 3053, 3064, 3066, 3068, 3071, 3303, 4031
Genoa Conference, res. 3053
League of Nations, res. 3054
Steamship subsidies and, 2923
Substantial reduction in, amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Tariff act of 1897, 3014
Tariff Commission, evidence, 2296
Tinplate industry, 2400
Trade commissioners and, 1840, 2923
United States and, 3010. *See also* United States
Unjust tax, 3062
Valuation of goods for customs, 90
War taxation, 2985
Weapon, 3477, 3907. *See also* Treaties, French
Western Canada and, 1887, 2747, 3062
Undue burden, 2781
Who pays? 2839
Tariff—*Con.*
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion, 2853. *See also* Budget
Wool, 2866
Woollen goods, reduction, 2990
Woollen industry, 3458
Protection, M. (Drummond) 928

Taxation. *See also* Agriculture; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill; Inland Revenue; Protection; Special War Revenue; Tariff
Agricultural implements, 1850. *See also that title*
Apportionment of, burdensome to poor, 2789
Automobile, qu. 1993, 2841. *See also that title*
Banff hotel, 3435
Bank drafts, 3925, 3928
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and Beverages
Bill of exchange, 3923
Budget, failure to balance, 2831
Building prices and, 2165
Burden of, 1348, 1355, 1394, 1403, 1880, 2831. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Business profits, 2786, 2789, 2998. *See also* Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill
Notes given in payment, 4489
Riordan Pulp & Paper Company, arrears, qu. 1974, 4490
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Unpaid, 4440, 4489
Business Profits War Tax Act 1916, administration, 3949
Cheque tax, 23, 121, 332, 2706, 2859, 2948, 3034, 3929, 4409, 4423
Embossed cheques regulations, qu. 492
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequality of, 3063
Maximum
Limitation of, 2847, 2877, 2979, 3922
Reduced to $1, 2656
Passed back to farmers, 3039
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927
Responsibility for payment, 2877
Who pays? 3039
Cigarettes. *See* Customs and Excise
Collection, 89. *See also under this title* Income; Sales Tax
Methods, 2213, 2786
Commission, 4039
Commissioner of, salary, 3949, 4669
Confectionery and beverages, 2644, 2656, 2707, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Confectionery and beverages—*Con.*
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 3938, 4182
Soft drinks, tax on, qu. 624
Tax, revenue, qu. 624
Consumer, 2789. *See also that title*
Consumption tax. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Cost of living and, 2839. *See also that title*
Crude, 2788
Debt and, 2964
Depreciation and renewal allowance, 1711
Difficult and irritating, 2804, 2859
Direct, 2836, 2956, 3000, 3010, 3035
Results, qu. 281
Dominion lands, taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion, provincial and municipal, 2641
"Enormous" 2963
"Excessive" 1345, 1391, 1394, 2712
Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Exemptions. *See under this title,* Income, Children; Sales Tax; Receipt Tax
Experiments in, 2788
Express money orders, 3923
Extravagance and, 2785
Farmers paying taxes, 4224. *See also that title*
Four cardinal principles of, 66-67
Granville island, qu. 1485
Great Britain in, 1854
Reduction of, 2712
High, 2583, 2747, 2857, 3010
Exodus to United States, 2823
Implements of production, 2718. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Income, qu. 281, 1195, 2859. *See also* Income War Tax Act. Amdt. bill
Agricultural forms, 4498
Based on fallacious doctrine, 2913
Bonds exempt from, qu. 342
Bonds, interest rate and, 4494
Burdensome to urban tax-payer, 2745
Capital, 3027
Diverted from industry by, 2914
Children, exemption for, 2128, 2880, 3038, 4502
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1382
Collections, 2658, 2998
Cost of, qu. 733
Total, 2825
Community of property, 2880, 3038
Convictions, qu. 3582
Deductions, for educational and charitable donations, 3954
Dividends, 2881
Duplication, 2859

Taxation—*Con.*
Income—*Con.*
Exemption. *See also under this title,* Children
Small incomes, 2728, 4493
Up to $5,000 for head of family, 3038
Widows, 2934
Farmers, payments by, qu. 1259, 1486, 2845
Federal, provincial and municipal, 2825, 2859
Fines, qu. 2180, 3507
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Graduated, 2706, 2788, 2837, 2914, 3073
Great Britain, 2788
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Income and investment discouraged, 2914
Incomes earned and unearned, 2745, 2788
Unearned, 2718, 2858, 2880, 2954, 2967, 3026
Dividends, 3038
Increase, 2658, 3010
"Intolerable nuisance," 2914
Moose Jaw office, qu. 2699
Penalties, 2979
Protest from people who do not pay, 2786
Revenue and production, lessening of, 2913
Revenue, cost of collection, farmers, qu. 1259, 4224
Rich not bearing fair share, 2788
Scale of, 2985
Steeply graded, 2728
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Total assesment, qu. 2393
United States, reduction, 2913
Vancouver offices, qu. 912
Western farmers, 1889
Western provinces, collections, qu. 2206
Yorkton office, qu. 384
Income War Tax Act, administration, 3949
Increase of, 1121, 1822, 1854, 2712, 2784, 2987, 2997
Indirect, 1440, 2789, 3027, 4423
Inequitable, 2728, 2788
Inheritance, 1383, 2728, 2788, 2792, 2802, 2803, 2810, 2825, 2837, 2909, 3026, 3073
Inland revenue, use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Land values, 1105, 1118, 1178, 1344, 2728, 2745, 2778, 2803
Unearned increment, 3016
Liberal platform, 2003
London Spectator, statement of, 1122
Luxuries, 915, 2003, 2706, 2710, 2718, 2742, 2745, 2789, 2853, 2858, 2989, 2997, 2999, 3073, 3910
Excise tax on, 2779
Tax collections, qu. 2393

Taxation—*Con.*
Manitoba
Agricultural production and, 1404
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Municipal, 426, 2641, 3445
Burdensome, 2836
Unpaid, 2768, 2769, 2953, 2961
Natural resources, 2729
Necessaries of life, on, 2710, 2728, 2736, 2754, 2789, 2999
New, 2857, 2997, 3078
Not wanted, 2914
Per capita, 1121, 3026
Post office money orders, 3923
Postal rates, 1780
War rate, 2745
Postage stamps, use for excise taxes, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3938, 4435
Prices, increase of, 2716. *See also* Prices
Promissory notes, 3063, 3923
Provincial amusement tax, 2826
Railway deficits and, 2905, 3006
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2643, 2656, 2705, 3034, 3923, 3934, 3935, 3938, 4423
Evasion of, 2706, 2826
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequity of, 2826
Payment in postage stamps, 1815
Revison of, 4409
Reduction of, 2749
Relief from, 3038
Responsibility for, 2920
Revenue, 2745
Revenue and postage stamps, 1815, 1818
Revenue stamps, selling cost, 1819
Sales tax, qu. 281, 1427, 2656, 2742, 2789, 4181 4183, 4425. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alberta collections, qu. 2417
Amendment, 3031
Automobiles, qu. 1993
Books and book bindings 1870
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1157
Carbonic acid gas, 3938, 4182
Collection, qu. 285, qu. 938, 2840
At source, 2643, 2656, 2840, 2998, 3031, 3038, 3938, 4181
Change in method, 2734
Domestic goods, 2840
Foreign goods, 2840
Complexity of, 2642
Confectionery and beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery
Contracts affected, 2750
Cost of living, 2839
Increase, 1813
Date of taking effect, 2657, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Sales tax—*Con.*
Domestic and foreign goods, 2804
Drain tiles, 2742, 3046, 3063, 4183
Duty-free goods, 2979
Exemptions, qu. 491, 2643, 2998, 3031, 3063, 4431
Drain tiles, 3046. *See also under this sub-title,* Drain Tiles
Newsprint, 2999, 3046
Raw wool, 2998
Rulings as to, qu. 708
Tomato plants, 4432
Exports, 4364
French treaty, 2279, 2280, 2299
Furs, 2742
Imports, 4409
Increase in, 2213, 2804, 3033, 3066, 3078
Jobbers, 4410, 4433
Licensed manufacturer or producer, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Manufacturers, licensed, 4410, 4433
Michigan Central bridge, remission, qu. 1257
Middleman, encouragement, 2805
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 915
Necessaries of life, 2999
Newsprint, 2979, 2999, 3046
Nursery stock, 4432
Origin of finished articles, 2840
Passing on, 2750, 2912, 4411, 4416
Prime Minister's speech in 1921, 2997
Profiteering, 2997
Proposed change, petition against, 2958
Public libraries, 1870
Pyramiding, 915, 2823, 2859, 2912, 2998, 3036, 3031, 3033, 4423
Regina Photo Supply Company, qu. 518
Simplification, 3082
Suggested abolition of, 1230
Summer trade, 2912
Tomato plants, 4432
Union Jack, 4514
Wool, 2742
Workability, 2786
School land taxes, 3445
Schools closed from inability to pay, 1388
Unpaid, 4205
Single tax on vacant land, 1105, 1344. *See also under this title,* Land
Sixty-seven per cent paid by consumer, 2789
Suggested conference on, 67
Tariff and, 2859, 2839, 3068
"Taxed to death," 2826, 4493
Taxes, banks' refusal to pay, 4099

Taxation—*Con.*
Tax reductions, 2642
Tax sales,
Alberta, 4062
Manitoba, 2961
Travellers' cheques, 3923
Turnover tax, 2841, 2859, 2916
Unpaid, 637, 1388, 3257, 3445, 4205
Unimproved land. *See under this title,* Land
War, 2788, 2985, 3028
War profits, 2788, 2985
War taxes, collection by Post Office dept. 1815
Western farmers unable to meet, 1202, 2781

Tax-Exempt Bonds. *See* Bonds

Technical Education Act. *See* Labour

Technical Positions. *See* Civil Service

Telegraphs and Telephones. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Wireless
Battleford-Isle la Crosse, 1017
British cable service, Canadian Press, 4727
British Columbia-mainland, 1017
Canadian National Telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Fort Qu'Appelle-Humboldt, qu. 383
Great North Western Telegraph Company, qu. 707, 2471
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Manitoba, 2285
Northwest territories, 3944
Nova Scotia, 4590
Prince Edward Island, 2682
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph lines, qu. 3138, qu. 3262
St. Charles-Peribonka telegraph line, qu. 3262
Vancouver island district, 1017
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal, qu. 3140
Wireless stations, 3337
Yukon telegraph system, 150, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206, qu. 2417

Temiscouata forest fires, 4010

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Temporary Employees. *See* Civil Service

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* Canadian National Railways; St. John

Terrebonne public building, 2690, 4614

Territories Act Amdt. *See* Northwest Territories

Testing of Seed. *See* Seed Inspection

Textiles. *See also* British Preference; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty
Clothing, British preference, 3032
Collars and cuffs, duties 3048
Cottons
British preference, 3463
Cotton manufacturers, combine, 2534
Duty, 3035, 3048. *See also* Treaties, French
For manufacture of pneumatic tires, duty, 2654, 3487
French treaty, 1987
Dominion Textile Company
Combine, 2563
McSweeney, late Senator, statement, 3464
Securities and dividends, 3463
Stock, 1853
Embroideries. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates, 1964
Knitting industry, artificial silk and, 2958
Laces, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Linen, 3897
Profits, 3464
Silks. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Artificial silk
Duty, 2820, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3489
Industry, 2658, 2703, 2798, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 3069, 3075, 3492
Knitting industry and, 2958
Tops or waste or artificial fibre silk, drawbacks, 3896
Yarns and fabrics, 2654
Duty, 2704, 3046, 3488, 3489
Imports of, 445, 2397
Silk cloth woven in the gum, duty, 3489
Silk industry, 2397, 2853
Canadian, 2397
French treaty and, 1977
Textile industry, 3466
Velvets and velveteens, duty, 3035, 3488
Woollen industry, 3458. *See also* Wool
Blankets, duty, 3048
British preference, 2958, 2989, 3034, 3458, 3459
Clothing, 3048
Competition from Great Britain and France, 2958
Duties, 3048
Drawbacks and, qu. 1994
Legislation to assist, qu. 4184
Marking of, 2973
Penmans, stock quotations and dividends, 3463
Preferential tariff and, 3458
Prices, 2990, 3459

Textiles—*Con.*
Woollen industry—*Con.*
Protection of, M. (Mr. Drummond) 928
Woollen goods, manufacture of 2866
Yarn, 3489, 3896

Thetford Mines, strike, 2207

Thomas, Mr. A. J. *See* Canadian National Railways

Thomas, Mr. J. H., 46

Thomson Line, ocean freight rates, 2127

Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856

Thompson, the late Right Hon. Sir John, copyrights, 2140

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Cold storage companies, 191
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2055
Field crop competitions, 600, 602
Montreal cold storage, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204
Welland canal construction contracts, qu. 1489

Thornton, Sir Henry Worth, 103, 126, 284. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Cattle shipments, space, 3040
West Indian service, 3379
Capital expenditure, 3811
Criticism of, 3640
Fuel supply, evidence, Senate com., 1919
Hudson Bay railway, 4683
Immigration, 1167
Reported statement, 2795, 2844
Western provinces, conditions, 2962

Thoroughbred horses. *See* Race Track Betting

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Improvement and management of harbour)
Res. 3399, 3963; 1r., 2r., com., 3965; com., 3r., 4207

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1752
Lindsay market scales, 208

Tidal and Current Survey. *See* Marine

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C.
Grand Trunk arbitration, qu. 730, qu. 1029
Payments to, 1154, qu, 1661

Timber. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lumber
Areas, limits of, 4206
Available supplies, 818
Creosoted, qu. 813, qu. 1137
Permits to cut on Dominion Lands, qu. 203, 3398, 4206. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Shortage, 2711

Timber Wolves, destruction of live stock, 597

Times, The, London, Hudson Bay railway, 1059

Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, 1071, 3056

Tinplate Industry, 2751
Establishment in Toronto, 2819
Sales tax, 4418
Tariff uncertainty, 2819

Titles, Honours and Decorations
Abolition of, 210
Banting, Dr., 4645
M. (Mr. Ladner) 1285, neg. on div. 1299
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1292
Nickle resolution, 1286-98

Tobacco. *See also* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Bootlegging in, 2989
Cigarettes
Bootlegging, 3230
Consumption, qu. 516
Customs duty, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 4392
Excise duty, 2655, 2825, 3229
Tax on, 2657
Cigars, consumption, qu. 517
Duty, 2913, 2988
Experimental stations, 459, 465
Harrow, 466
Home-grown, 4209. *See also* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Imports, qu. 1258
Revenue, loss of, 2913

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Accredited herd system, qu. 206
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Canadian National railways, mileage and cost 914
Haney, Mr. M. J., 3355
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Public debt, 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914
Public expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913

Tobin, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement
Farms in Richmond county, qu. 913
Wolfe county, qu. 913
War expenditure, 1914-1922, qu. 914

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. Walter, decision, question not referred to com. 3267

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd, system, 578, 3302
Animal diseases, inspection, 2202
British Columbia liquor laws, 2411
Prices, 2411
British Empire exhibition, 1873
Budget 2861. Congratulations to Finance Minister; government coming round to protection; unfair to Canada to cut down tariff; United States and oriental competition; copper bounty; Trail smelter; amendment; inclusion of planks from Liberal platform of 1919; agricultural conditions; disorganized markets, 2861; profitable and unprofitable lines of agriculture; single-crop farming; mixed farming with live stock as basis; prices low and crops high; plugging up the leaks; marketing of live stock; policy and prices; no advantage in breeding scrub stock, 2862; dairying industry; unprofitable herds; yield and cost; Nappan experimental station; experiment with scrub cows; value of industry to country; export markets; Canadian butter in Great Britain, 2863; competition of Denmark, Holland and New Zealand, 2863; butter grading; hog and export bacon industry; types and weights; Wiltshire sides; Danish bacon, competition of, 2864; prices at Chicago and Toronto; bacon from corn-fed hogs; breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865; sheep and wool industry; woollen manufacturing industry; marketing of lambs, 2866; wheat screenings as feed for lambs; inferior stock, loss from; animal contagious diseases; tuberculosis; hog cholera; research work; internal parasites; tuberculin test, 2867; immunization from tuberculosis; human tuberculosis; work of Dr. Watson; glanders; agricultural products, distribution; cheaper transportation and equalization of freight rates; Pacific coast trade; Panama canal, 2868; export markets; oriental trade; co-operative selling; farm credits; agricultural education; better farming methods; Central experimental farm; immigration, exclusion of Asiatics; better understanding between farmer and city-man, 2869; no time for pessimism; pioneering; Bruce county in early days; summary of proposed policy
Buffalo
Slaughter of, 3440
Tuberculosis 3440
Business of the House, supply, relevancy, 4719
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2411
Chinese immigration bill, 2316
Merchants, 2316
Cold storage, 186
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 485
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Butter substitutes, 3151
"Manna" 3152
Renovated butter, 4251, 4255
Dairying industry, 2864, 3296
Butter, pasteurization 3298
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4672
Destructive Insects and Pests Act, 595
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms, 476-485
Fishery cruiser, Victoria, 4708
Freight rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1922
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, registration, 2397
Health of animals, 578
Tuberculin test, 578, 2867
Tuberculosis eradication, 3989
Indians cattle, 2159
Iron deposits, Vancouver island, 2514
Liquor
British Columbia plebiscite, 2441
Prices, 2441
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 193, 2202, 2292
Live stock industry, 476, 589. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Masters and mates, examination, 2610
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Nicomen island, protection, 626
Oleomargarine
Dairying industry and, 3296
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3510
Manufacture 3152
Paternal legislation, 727

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3707
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 723
Renovated butter, 3151, 4255
Seed testing bill, 278, 2305
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, Agriculture dept., 579, 2868

Tomato Plants. *See* Customs; Taxation

Topographical Surveys. *See* Surveys

Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Canadian National Railways
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4198
Electric lines, 2393
King and Yonge streets property, qu. 814, qu. 1663, qu. 1994, 2819, 2481, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Casualty clearing building, 4621
Customs house building, 3277, 4621, 4624
Fuel supply, 3200
Harbour improvements, 984, 985, 1011, 2678, 3076, 3774, 4444, 4445, 4562, 4578, 4610
Level crossings, 2477
Penny bank of. *See* Penny Bank
Post office building, 1780, 3277
Postal receipts, increase, 2819
Postal revenue, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Restaurants, profiteering, 2586
Seed branch offices, 4621
Soldiers' Comfort branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Soldier Settlement board, 2029
Street railway system, 2475, 3056
Tin-plate industry, 2819
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Toronto Transportation Commission, 1703
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4335, 4442
University of, scholarships, 878
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 517, 2477, qu. 4011, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442, 4447

Toronto Eastern Railway, 2475

Toronto Suburban Railway, qu. 280, 2181, 2475, qu. 2612, 3324

Tourist Traffic. *See* Canadian National Parks

Tower. *See* Parliament buildings

Tracadie Lazaretto, 702

Trade. *See also* Address; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; speeches on Budget; Tariff; Trade and Commerce; Treaties, French, Italian
Anglo-Canadian, fostering of, qu. 284
Annual report, 1910
Australia, with, 1848, 2964, 3476
Balance of, 2922
Bankruptcy, 648. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill
Canadian representative at Washington, 2735
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
China and India with, 1840
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717
Competition, Great Britain and Germany, 2752
Conditions, analysis, 2984
Cuba with, 308, 1840
Enlarged, advantages of, 2910
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Fiji islands, 1848
France with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, with, 437. *See also* British Preference
Increase in, 2784
International 2923
Interprovincial, 2177, 2748
Italy with, 2395. *See also* Treaties, Italian
Japan with, 1449
Pacific coast, 2868
Percentage of imports and exports, 2843
Oriental, 507. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Potatoes in, 308. *See also* Vegetables
Reciprocity with United States, 2650. *See also that title*
Russian trade mission, 986
Spain with, 2397
Steamship services. *See that title*
Switzerland, with 2397
Trade commissioners, 1837
Tariff and, 2923
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269, 2301
United States with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
West Indies, 3382
World competition, 2799

Trade and Commerce Department
Bounties, administration 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Trade commissioners, 1840
Commissioner of patents, duties, 2065
Consular and commercial agents qu. 284
Elevators, terminal, maintenance, 810

Trade and Commerce Department—*Con.*
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031; 3377, 4003, 4701
Exhibitions, 1467
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171. *See also* Steamship Services
O'Halloran, Mr. George F., Commissioner of Patents, 4673
Patent and Copyright branch, salaries, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 1837, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade, annual report, 1910
Trade commissioners and agents, 856, 1837
Weights and measures, inspection, 810

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
(Registration of industrial designs)
1r., 331; 2r., 2063; com., 2293; 3r., 2294

Trades and Labour Council. *See* Labour

Trades Union Congress. *See* Labour

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Resignation of, 2178

Trail, B.C., smelter, 2861, 2944

Transportation. *See also* Canadian National Railway; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Coal, 1247. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Equalization of rates, 1253. *See also* Freight Rates
Gaspe, 1243
Improvement of, 2745
Inadequate. *See* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Peace river district, 1433, 1440
Problems, 126. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Reduction, cost of, 1400
Shipping combine, 1134
Steamship companies, immigration and, 1193, 1201. *See also* Immigration
Water, 2979
Western Canada, 1440
Wheat, cost of, qu. 385. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Travellers' Cheques, tax. *See* Taxation, Cheque

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449, 2399
Australia, with, 245, 1848. *See also* Australia
Belgium, 246
Canada-West Indies, 3378
French Treaty, 9, 97, 436, 2657, 2815, 2832, 2964, 4457
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2001
Agricultural products, 1978, 2210, 2235
Aluminum, 1989
Analysis of, Mr. Chaplin, 1978
Anchovies and sardines, 2008
Automobiles, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Bacon, ham and pork products 1978
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Boots and shoes, 1990
Bottles, 2218
Braids and cords, 2213
Brandies, 2643, 2742, 2999, 3478
Brass and copper ware, 1981
British preference, 2005
Bronze powder, 1979, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2016, 2270
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998, 2017
Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217
Brushes, 2214
Building materials, 1982
Butter, 2273
Buttons, 2214, 2234
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Cement, 1984
Cereals, 1984, 2006
Chemicals, 1980-5
Coal tar derivatives, 1986
Cobalt products, 2263, 2300
Competition, unfair, 2300
Condensed milk, 1984
Consumer, relief to, 3049
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Convention approved, 2255
Cotton manufactures, 1987, 2218, 2263
Cutlery, 1988
Dairy products, 1984
Direct importation, through Canadian ports, 1772, 2303, 2949
Duty, reductions in, 438, 2710
Eggs, 1978
Electrical apparatus, telephones, 2214
Electric lamps, incandescent, 1980
Embroideries, 2008, 2211, 2214, 2999
Engines and machinery, 1981-8
Favoured nation, 439, 443, 2005, 2007, 2014, 2210, 2213, 2219, 2232, 2234, 2241, 2271, 2395, 3035
Feathers and ornaments for hats, 3035
Fish, fresh and preserved, 1978, 2006, 2235

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Flour, 1978
France
Exports to, 2213
Friendly relations with, 2216
Trade with, 2209, 2255
French Consul General and, 2229
Furniture, 1982-9
Furs, 1981
Handkerchiefs, 2214, 3035
Hen feathers, 1978
Horses, 1978
Household necessaries, 441
Imports and exports, 1977, 2230
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Iron and steel, 1985-8, 2001
Japan, 2214
Trade concessions to, 450
Laces, 3035
Lard, 1978
Liberal platform, 2211
Linen yarns and thread, 1981
Live stock, 1983, 2211
Luxuries, 444, 450, 2003, 2011, 2014, 2213, 2221, 2259, 2742, 2989, 2999, 3035, 3910
Machinery and parts, 441
Manufacturers and, 2236. *See also under this title,* Canadian Manufacturers
Meats
Cured, 1978
Fresh, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978
Millinery, 3035
Minimum tariff, 440
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2218
Musical instruments 1982
Pianos and organs, 1990, 2237
Neighbouring countries, concessions to, 450, 2131, 2215, 2219, 2273
Oleomargarine, 1984
Paper and paper products, 1987
Paper board, 1981
Perfumery, 3035
Potatoes, 1984
Poultry, 1983
Revenue, loss of, 2014, 2209, 2235
Ribbons, 3035
Rubber, manufactures of, 1990, 2237
Sales tax, 2279, 2299
Sewing machines, 2237
Silks, 448, 2209, 2215, 2221, 2255, 2264, 2266, 2300, 2397, 2398, 2742, 3035
Specific duties, 2215
Spelter, 1979
Summary of, 2232
Switzerland, imports from, 2213, 2255

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Tabled, 54
Tariff and, 438, 2710, 4074
Tariff weapon, 3907-10
Treaty of 1907, 2004-29
United States, 2011
Concessions to, 449
Trade with France, 1991, 1997, 2213, 2218, 2229, 2276, 2396
Treatment, Unnited States and Canada, 441
Velvets and velveteens, 3488
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wheat, 1978
Wines, 438, 442, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225, 2302, 2643, 2710, 2999, 3035, 3937
Wood, manufactures of, 1982-9
Zinc, 1979
French Treaty Bill, res. 331, 436-456; 1r., 456; M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., 1910; withdrawn 1911; renewed 1977; discussion, 1977, 1995; 2r., on div. 2250-51; com. 2251-55-90-99; 3r., 2347
Halibut Fisheries Treaty with United States. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill
Approval of, res. 4440, 4455; agreed to, 4480
Correspondence, 1032, 1212
Tabled, 1256
Joint res. of parliament, transmission, 4736
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857-8
Procedure, 4437
Inquiry as to, 4132
Rider inserted by United States senate, 1308
Signing of, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664
Italian Treaty, 9, 2394, 2701, 2815, 2832
Consideration postponed, 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401, 2949
Favoured nation treatment, 2394
Border states, 2395
France, 2395
Italy, trade with, 2395
Relief to consumers, 3049
Signing of, 2403
Tabled, 89
Italian Treaty Bill, res. 331, 2394; 1r., 2395; 2r., com., 2395; 3r., 2437, 2701
Negotiatiton of, expenses, 3989
Peace treaty
Enemy property custodian, qu. 1486
International Labour Conference, 1441
Light thrown on causes of war, 2725
Orders in council, 767
Postal Treaty with the United States, 2, 4529

Treaties—*Con.*
Rush-Bagot, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Germain, 653
Switzerland, 2398
Trade, 437. *See also under this titlte,* Australia, French, Italian
United States. *See also* Reciprocity, United States
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Reciprocity treaty of 1854, 2910
Versailles, qu. 279, 1631-2, 3994. *See also* Germany, Reparations; War Claims
Labour, right to organize, 2889, 2895
Modification of, 4653

Tree Planting. *See* Forests and Forestry

Tremblay, General. *See* Quebec Harbour Commission

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton
Emigration from, 2823
Wool-combing industry, 2823, 2827, 3461

Trial by Jury. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Yukon Act Amdt.

Trials. *See* Justice
Eskimos, Hershell Island. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Troops. *See* National Defence
Use of in labour troubles. *See* Labour

Trout-Fishing. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868

Truro park, 3440

Trustees. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Trusts. *See* Combines

Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1447. *See also* Immigration, Chinese

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals; Live Stock; Pensions
Animals, 462-486. *See also* Live Stock; Animal Contagious Diseases
Tuberculin test, 2867, 3284, 3300
Attributable to military service, 3850
Bovine and human, 2868
Buffalo, 3439
Cattle, 2131-38. *See also* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Eradication, 3989
Dairy products, 3299

Tuberculosis—*Con.*
Immunization from, 2868
Indians, 2152
Live stock, 2867
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Military hospitals, 670
Pension obligation and, 3850
Returned soldiers, deaths from, qu. 3134
Serum, 2868
Tuberculous Veterans Association, petition, 4536

Tugboats. *See* Vessels

Tupper, Sir Charles
French treaty, 1991
Title, 1295

Turkey, threatened war with, 2815. *See also* Near East Crisis

Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Turnover Tax. *See* Taxation

Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Tutankhamen, King, 755, 1761
Inheritance tax, 2788

Two Months' Supply. *See* Interim Supply

Typewriters. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Tyrrell, Mr. J. W., Hudson Bay region, 1072

Ukrainians. *See also* West Ukrainian Republic
Immigration, 1396, 1883
Settlement of, 1341

Uncleaned Screenings. *See* Grain, Elevators

Undesirable Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Unearned Income. *See* Taxation

Unemployment. *See* Labour; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Unification. *See* Canadian National Railways

Unimproved Land. *See* Land; Taxation

Union Act, 1364, 1365

Union Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Union Label. *See* Labour

Union Nationale Française, immigration, 1877

Union of South Africa. *See* South Africa

Unions. *See* Labour

Unit of Representation. *See* Redistribution

United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 81, 1440

United Farmers of Manitoba, 1462

United Farmers of Ontario
Combines and trusts, 2584
Immigration, 1191
Proportional representation, 425

United Mines Workers of America. *See* Labour; Howat

United States. *See also* Reciprocity; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration, cost of, 1155
Agriculture
Economic organization, 1857
Encouragement of, 1390
Agricultural conditions, 642, 2829
Agricultural implements, duty free, 3017, 3062
Agricultural products, 2751
Markets for, 2810, 2869
Alien enemy property, custodian, 2496, 3823
American Expeditionary Force, mental tests, 1219
American legion, 2444
Annexation, 93
Asiatic immigration, exclusion, 1194
Banking system, 4083
Bankruptcy law, 3092
Bean-growing industry, 2981
Boots and shoes, duty, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499
Borrowings from, 93-94
British debt, 2879, 2918
Budget, 3341
Building boom, 1129, 3004, 3017
Cabinet officers, number of, 3043
Canadian exhibitions in, 1454
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3649
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361, 4480
Canadian railways, ocean ports in, 1754-5
Canadian representation, 4001, 4664. *See also that title*
Canadian tariff policy and, 3010
Canadians in, 43. *See also* Emigration
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cattle, export to, 1410, 2871
Chinese immigration, 2313, 4349
Coal, 3203. *See also that title*
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Embargo on, 1265, 1279
Exports from. *See* Coal
Purchased for railways, 1277
Strikes and labour unions, 2786
Supplies from, 1262

United States—*Con.*
Coloured population, 2316
Combines, grand jury system, 2585
Competition from, 2861. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Conditions following Civil War, 1122, 1232
Congressional library, 2693
Copyright, 2140. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Cost of living, 1812
Customs duties, per capita, 2738
Debt, per capita, 2956
Duties against, reduction by order in council, 2649
Emergency tariff, 2847. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Effect upon Canadian export, 2847
Emigration of Canadians to, 21, 1082, 1085, 1975. *See also* Emigration
European reconstruction, 4654
Exports, 1838
Pulpwood to, 4347. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Fair Tariff League, 3070
Farmers' bloc, 2791
Federal Reserve Bank, 3059, 4124, 4407
Federal reserve system, 4069
Fishing industry, 2940
Fish, market for, 2906, 2946, 3002
Fishing schooner, Siloam, capture, 2207
Fishing vesels, purchase of bait, 3705
Halibut fishery treaty with. *See* Treaties, Halibut
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Use of Canadian ports by, 3361, 4480
Flour, ocean rates, 2127
Ford, Henry, presidential candidate, 2908
Fordney-McCumber tariff, 172, 2649, 2708, 2748, 2818, 2823, 2857, 2869, 2909, 2919, 2940, 2946, 2958, 2977, 2993, 2997, 3011, 3013, 3035, 3052, 3061, 3098
Cattle, 3293
Coal, 1275
Farmers' gains and losses, 3070
Pacific coast fisheries, 2734
Power of president to vary, 3902
France, trade with, 1991, 1997, 2011, 2209, 2213, 2222, 2276, 2396. *See also* Treaties, French
Free list, agricultural products, 2910
Free trade, 1403, 2738, 2746, 3013
Freight cars, interchange, 4697
French Canadians in, repatriation, 1462
French treaty. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Grand Trunk lines, 3197
Grain prices, 297-8. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

United States—*Con.*
Grain shipments through United States ports, 3763
Great Lakes disarmament, correspondence, 1307
Harding, late President, world peace, 2911
Highways, 3437
Hirtle, Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Hogs, corn-fed, 2865
Immigration and, 1248
After Civil War, 1885
Agencies in, 1875
Obstacles to,, 1416
Policy, 1885
Imports and exports, 2821, 2928, 3061
Income tax, 2986, 4503
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reductions, 2913
Industrial development, 2751
Industrial organization and competition, 2992
Inflation, 2800, 3004
Influence in Canada, 2934. *See also* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
Fuel investigation, 1279
Internationl boundaries, survey and demarcation, 3248
Japanese organizations, 2444
Labour delegates, detention at border, 2296, 2419, 2469, 2347, 2393
Labour demand, 1129. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Lake of the Woods water powers. *See that title*
Levels, qu. 2700
Liquor laws, 4295
Illicit traffic, alleged, 2208
McKinley tariff, 2910
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufactured products, 2751
Market for, 2856
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Movement of population to. *See* Emigration
National Reserve bank, 4145
Naturalization, 2443
Oriental problem, 2443
Oriental propaganda in, 1896
Pecuniary Clains Convention, 779
People from, stopped at border, 1167. *See also under this title* Labour delegates
Ports
Adulteration of Canadian grain, 3649, 3961
Competition. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Ocean, 2898
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Postal treaty, 4529
Potatoes, export to, qu. 621

United States—*Con.*
Prices, comparison of, 2742, 2916
Prosperity, 2657
Protection and, 2751
Pulpwood, export to, 3413, 3416. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Railway system, 3057
Unification, 1618
Railways
Earnings, flour transportation, 2960
Grain shipments, diversion to, 2898
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2707, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2843, 3847, 2905, 2917, 3454, 3473
Chicago Tribune, comment, 2733
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718
Standing offer, 3016
Relations with, 2905
Rural credit system, 642, 2829, 2930, 4043, 4046, 4130, 4298
Rural depopulation, 2829
Rural mail delivery, 1781
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3208, 3705, 3762, 4513. *See also that title*
Self-interest, 2918
Senate, constitution of, 1373, 1378
Silk industry, 2397, 2400
Strikes, 1629
Sugar boycott, 2734
Surplus, 2823
Tariff 1113, 1119. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Change of sentiment, 3013
Emigration and, 1093
Tinplate industry, 2400, 2751
Trade relations with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
Agents in Canada, qu. 284
Negotiations with, 3074
Revival, 2650
Unemployment, decrease of, 2650
Wages in, 1165. *See also under this title,* Emigration; Labour
War and, 2918
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2735. *See also* Canadian Representation
Welland canal construction, 3762
Wharves, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wheat, duty, 2993

Universities. *See also* Education
Bank directors and, 4025, 4073
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Graduates emigrating to the United States, 2732
Independent thought stifled, 3074

Universities—*Con.*
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Toronto, 878

Unopposed Motions for Paper
Accredited herds (Mr. Caldwell) 626
Agriculture dept. employees (Mr. Bouchard) 815
Alberta Drainage Company (Mr. Kellner) 3144
Arctic islands and northern Quebec (Mr. Parent) 814
Banff park, power rights (Mr. Shaw) 496
Banff springs and cave (Mr. Shaw) 496
Bank returns (Mr. Coote) 3264
British Columbia claims (Mr. Stevens) 708
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, (Sir Henry Drayton) 3705, 3822
Canadian National Railways
Equipment orders, (Mr. Meighen) 2701
Grand Trunk, United States terminals (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Lifting of steel, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1664
Orders in council (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Regulations (Mr. MacLaren) 496
Canadian Pacific Railway, Quebec terminals (Mr. Parent) 815
Cattle trade with Great Britain (Mr. Meighen) 208
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions (Mr. Manion) 330; (Mr. Meighen) 208
Dismissals (Mr. Hanson) 856
Positions exempted (Mr. Irvine) 914
Customs and Excise, legal work (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Disallowance of Nova Scotia legislation (Mr. Hanson) 208; (Sir Henry Drayton) 249, 208
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs. (Mr. Maybee) 3705
Eastern Lands Development Company, (Mr. Lapierre) 626, (Mr. Carruthers) 1635
Euclid Hall and Brant House, closing (Mr. Church) 4303
Export liquor warehouse licenses (Mr. Stevens) 3144
Freight rates, shipping, coastal regulations (Mr. Coote) 2613
Government printing, Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) 3144
Grand Trunk arbitration (Mr. d'Anjou) 1307
Halibut fishery treaty (Mr. Meighen) 1032

Unopposed Motions for Paper—*Con.*
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal (Mr. Irvine) 1868
Hudson Bay railway (Mr. Meighen) 208
Immigrant supplies, Quebec (Mr. Charters) 496
Lewis, John L., correspondence (Mr. Meighen) 250
Liquor, export, revenue, etc. (Mr. Good) 3704
Lindsay market scales (Mr. Thurston) 208
Margaree river salmon fisheries, (Mr. Hanson) 2700
New Brunswick export houses (Mr. Caldwell) 815
Newspapers and printing companies, contracts, (Mr. Black, Yukon) 1974
Nicomen island, protection (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Nipissing Indian reserve (Mr. Lapierre) 1307
North Oakville post office (Mr. Anderson) 914
Nova Scotia miners' strike (Sir Henry Drayton) 914
Orders in council
Canadian National Railways (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
P. C. 223 (Mr. Sutherland) 815
P. C. 1566 (Mr. Black, Yukon) 249
Oriental immigration (Mr. McQuarrie) 1307
Ottawa river water storage (Mr. Parent) 815
Printing contracts, newspapers, etc. (Mr. d'Anjou) 2298
Purchase of bait for fishing vessels (Mr. Forke) 3705
Railway lands, purchase or sales (Mr. Boys) 1739
St. Lawrence river waterway (Mr. Church) 3705
Sardine herring fishery (Mr. Duff) 2518
Six Nations Indian reserve (Mr. Senn) 1307
Soldier settlers, fire insurance (Mr. McMurray) 496
Sporting Mountain mail contract (Mr. Hanson) 856
Sydenham hospital (Mr. Ross, Kingston) 626
Technical and professional officials (Mr. Martell) 815
Testing of dairy cattle (Mr. Caldwell) 1307
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Toronto Suburban railway (Mr. Church) 2181
Trade commissioners (Mr. Putnam) 856
Vermilion town lots (Mr. Spencer) 1307
Wheat board, correspondence (Mr. McConica) 626
Winnipeg coal purchases (Mr. McMurray) 496

Unrest, Industrial. *See* Labour

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Emigration; Population

Vacancies. *See* Auditor General; House of Commons

Valcartier Camp Ground. *See* National Defence

Valleyfield, Canadian Bronze Powder Works, 1998, 2017

Valuation for Duty. *See* Customs

Vancouver (city)
Assay office, 3207
Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Board of Trade,
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 1869, 1910, 3189
Freight rates, equalization, 1953
Bridge, 1008
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 3272
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Granville island taxation, qu. 1485
Immigration
Chinese, 1444. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Immigration sheds, 1447, 1896
Income tax offices, qu. 912
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1451
Labour department, 1678
Orientals, business competition, 504, 1902, 2311
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Producers' Dairy Company, 2526
Proportional representation, 401
Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association 4266

Vancouver (port). *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Ballantyne pier, 257, 258
Dry dock, 1002, 2671
Elevator, 1057, qu. 1487, 3769
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Improvements, 2033
Grain shipments, 69, 1034, 3769
Harbour, 83, 110, 1002
Harbour commission, 387, qu. 912
Kitsilano reserve and, 383
Vacancies, 1372
Port development, 1051

Vancouver Harbour Advances Bill
Res. 198, 255; 1r., 269-270; 2r., com., 3r., 332

Vancouver Island, iron deposits, 2514

Van Koughnet, Mrs., Soldiers' Comfort Branch, Toronto, 4727

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables; Treaties, French Treaty
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canned, imports, 445
Competition from United States, 2977
Dehydration of, 4674
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Potatoes
Acreage and production, 2934
Diseases, 595
Duty, 2651, 2707, 2959, 2980, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Free trade in, 2820
Freight rates, 137-138
French treaty, 1984
Grading, 598. *See also* Root Vegetables
Growers, 137
Imports, qu. 617, 2820, 2959
Inspection, 598
New Brunswick, 2763
Potato-growing industry, 308
Prices, 2820
Prince Edward Island, 131, 2763
Reciprocity in, 2993
Seed, inspection of, 2306
United States
Competition, 2977
Exports, qu. 621
Wharfage tolls, 975
Root vegetables, sale and inspection, 937
Tomato plants, customs duty, 4432

Velvets. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty

Veniot, Premier, St. John river wharves, qu. 1488

Vermilion, Alberta, town lots, 1307
Purchases, 489
Rental by government, qu. 2417

Verret, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826

Versailles, Treaty of, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Treaties
International Labour Conference, 1631

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine; Shipping
Acadia, 1044, 3336
Alaskan wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160
Algerine, qu. 1763

Vessels—*Con.*
Arctic, 3944, 4012
Bayfield, 3336
Bonaventure, 1044
Boethic, 1044
Canadian, Chinese sailors on, 2334
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cartier, 3336
Challenger, 1742
Crews, 2670. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
Eureka, 1364
Fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Foreign. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Gleeful, tug, qu. 1763
John D. Hazen, 3160
Lady Grey, 3160
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Lillooet, 3336
Llandovery Castle, loss of, 1745
Malaspina, 2207
Marvale, wreck, 3333
Mikula, icebreaker, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Minto, 1044
Montcalm, 2614, 3160
Monte Grappa, foundering, qu. 912
Murray Stewart, tug, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354
Reliance, qu. 812
Restless, 3336
Siloam, seizure, 2207
Space for cattle. *See* Live Stock, Shipments
Stanley, 2614
Taibu Maru, 859
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Tuscan Prince, wreck of, qu. 1763
Wireless equipment, 3355

Vetcraft Shops. *See* Soldiers

Veterans' Associations. *See* Pensions

Veterinary Surgeons, drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Veto. *See* Disallowance

Vickers Company
Cancellation of contract, 1746
Hydro-planes, 1748
War claim, 1745
Canadian Vickers, qu. 2205
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3780
Hopper barge construction, contract, 3350

Victoria, B.C.
Dominion astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dry dock, 1002

Victoria, B.C.—*Con.*
Harbour, dredging, 110, 1014
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, qu. 3137

Victoria, vacancy. *See* Cape Breton North and Victoria

Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Ammunition, 886
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079-4124
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087, 3089
Business of the House, Speaker's rulings, 4076
Canadian National Railways, deficits, 4190
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Copper bounty bill, 4375
Editorial Committee, French publications, 1670
French translation and printing, 1489, 1670
Halibut fishery treaty, 4467
Imperial Conference, 4639
Indemnity of members, 4237
Labour, right to organize, 2894
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4237
Petition of right, fiats, 3222
Powell River Paper Company, 2894
Public ownership of railways, 4191
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 713, 716, 737
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4237-46

Ville Marie wharf, 981

Vimy Ridge Memorial Site, 2, 3, 12
Gift of by France, 65, 2832
Accepted, 180
Agreement, 181
Joint res. of parliament, 811, 3819
Message from his Ecellency the Governor General, 1631
President, French Republic
Letter from, 1538
Joint res. to, 811

Vincent, Mr. J. U., 1806

Vocational Training. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Vote, Lack of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence

Voting in Divisions. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Wages. *See* Cost of Living; Labour

Wainwright Buffalo Herd, 2773, 3407, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 4702

Waldron, Mr. Gordon, United Farmers of Ontario, 425

Walker, Sir Edmund, immigration, 1343

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2133
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2056-9
Health of animals, 581
Historic sites, 3432
Port Dover, Ont., Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Income tax, revenue, cost, etc. qu. 1259
Life-saving station, Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Oleomargarine, drawback on materials, 3503
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Radiotelegraph stations, lake Erie, 3338

Want of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Wanipigow River dam, 1000

War. *See also* Germany, Reparations; National Defence
British expeditionary force 3885
Burdens, 2967, 2981. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canada's participation in, 4655. *See also that title;* Imperial Conference
Canadian expeditionary force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Causes of, 2725
Claims. *See* War Claims
Conditions following, 1231. *See also* Immigration
Debt, 2797. *See also* Pubic Debt
Capital levy 2722-28
Expenditure 2915, 2920
Naval 110
Responsibility for 3078
1914-1922, qu. 914
French-Canadians, bravery 2935
Glorification of, 2686
League of Nations and, 3993
Loans. *See that title*
Material, sale of, 2986
Medals 1743
Medical supplies, purchase of, 2921
Middlemen, 2921
Monuments and Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge
Pensions. *See that title*

War—*Con.*
Profiteering, 2585, 2981
Profits, taxation of, 2788, 2985
Reparations. *See* Germany
Responsibility for. *See* Germany
Retired officers, serving in. *See* Militia Pension Act Amdt.
Revenues collected during, 2985
Rhineland occupation, cost of, qu. 2696
Scandals, 2815
Davidson commission, qu. 812
Taxation, 2788, 3028. *See also that title*
War profits tax, 2788, 2985
United States and, 2918

War Claims. *See also* Alien Enemy Property; Germany, Reparations
Adjustment of, qu. 1486, 1745
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, qu. 3142
Canadian claims against Germany, 2496
Canadian Pacific Railway shares, 2496
German claims against Canadians, 2496
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500
Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745
Massey-Harris Company, settlement of, 2497
Militia services, 900
Statement of expenditure, 1747
Naval service, 900
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment as commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Secretary of State, 2495
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce vote, 2502, neg. 2504
Statement of, 2496
Vickers, contract, cancellation, 1746

War Measures Act, Oleomargarine, 3528. *See also* Oleomargarine; M. (Mr. Carroll)

War Revenue Act. *See* Special War Revenue

War Service, Repatriation. *See* Naturalization Act

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Budget, 2959. "Annual family squabble"; zigzag course of debate; arguments for and against protection; more important matters than the tariff; freight rates; suspension of coasting regulations, 2959; increase of lake grain rates; the "shipping barons"; discrimination by Canadian boats in favour of United States lake ports; milling in bond; United States railway earnings from transportation of flour, 2960; Crowsnest pass agreement; saving in railway rates absorbed by shipping

Ward, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
companies; western agricultural conditions and demands; talk of secession; tax sales in Manitoba, 2961; conditions in Saskatchewan; what is the matter with western Canada? mortgaged farms; remoteness from tidewater; high interest rates; increased dependence upon agricultural prosperity; gratuities to Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern directors and officials, 2962; cattle shipments to Great Britain, space and rates; public debt; taxation; interest payments; New York loan, April 1922; the spectre of debt; doing business with borrowed money, 2963
Canadian National Railways, retiring gratuities, 1483, qu. 1632, 1687, 2962
Unorganized districts, road-building, 3258
Welland canal construction, 3789

Warehouses. *See* Canada Temperance; Customs; Grain; Liquor

Warlike Stores. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Agricultural conditions, 1423
Alberta coal
Freight rates, 3009
Resources, 1282
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 549, 555
Climatic conditions of West, 1423
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Edmonton Indian school, 2165
Emigration to the United States, 1422
Experimental farms, 467
Farm labour, 1424
Forest protection, 3418
M. (Mr. Michaud) 825
Fuel supply, 795
M. (Mr. Church) 1282
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1055
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1425
Policy, 1421
Speeches, adverse effect of, 1423
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3513, 3516, 3519, 3539
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 758
Reference to, 1425
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1151

Warner, Mr. D. W.—*Con.*
Rural mail delivery, western provinces, 1791
Tariff, immigration and, 1424
Tree-planting, 3418
Vancouver harbour bill, 266
Wheat-growing, 1423

Washington. *See also* United States
British Ambassador at, 858, 4457. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
Canadian representative at, 2735, 3017, 3085, 4001, 4664
Congressional library, 2693
Disarmament conference, 2911, 4000
Visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823

Waste Paper, disposal by government departments, qu. 1028, 1713

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers. *See also* Fuel Supply; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration of, 3420
Alienation of, 3422
Canadian national parks, 3442, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Forest Reserves
Banff, 3750, 3939
Carillon rapids, 659
Cedar rapids, 659
Development of, 3422
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Dominion Power Board, 3427
Eastern townships, 1248
Electric power, exportation, 658
Export duty, 2828
Suggested prohibition, 1272
United States to, 1266
Fuel supply, 3203. *See also that title*
Hudson Bay railway, 1040, 1065
Hudson Bay region, 1072
Grass river, 1065
Jurisdiction, 665
Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods, 3421, 3425, 4163. *See also that title*
Control Board, expenses, 4001
Leases, 3421
United States citizens to, 3426
National policy, development of, 1270
Nelson river, 3421
Niagara district, 3782
Niagara falls, 3940
Ottawa river, qu. 1974
Peace river district, 1433

Water Powers—*Con.*
Provincial ownership and jurisdiction, 3421
Railway electrification, 3422
Resources, 2750
Revenue, 2969
Rideau canal, qu. 622
St. Lawrence 2682
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3782
Surveys and investigations, 3203, 3420
Expenditure, 2969
Water Powers board, 3420
Water powers of the world estimated, 1270
Winnipeg river, 1214, 3421. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Waterhen Lakes, drainage, 3431, qu. 4303

Waterton Lakes
Highway, qu. 2085
Park, 3435

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways and, 3057
St. Lawrence river. *See that title*

Watson, Dr. glanders, treatment of, 579, 2868

Ways and Means, Committee of, 2640, 3084, 3229, 3231, 3454, 3705, 3895, 3963, 4162, 4181
Bounties on manila fibre and copper bars or rods, 3231
British preference, 3454
Budget speech, 2640
Customs tariff resolutions, 3454-74
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3229
Interim supply, 1539, 3705
Motion for, discussion, 3222
Notice of, 179
Supply bill, 4735
United States, reciprocity, 3454

Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145, 3995

Wealth of Canada
Estimated, 2719
History of, 2728

Webb, Sydney, report, 2545
Sydney and Beatrice, Decay of Capital and Civilization, 2726

Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Weed Seeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill; Seed

Weekly Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Weights and Measures
Cartage charge 810
Inspection 810
Peterborough district, qu. 492, 810

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

Welland, Haldimand, Lincoln Counties. *See* Redistribution

Wells, Mr. H. G., Civilization and the War, 2722

Well-Drilling Machinery. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Welsh Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

West Indies
Fish markets, 3002
Steamship service with, 3377
Trade, 3382. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
West Indies delegates, 3392

West Ukrainian Republic. *See also* Ukrainians
M. (Mr. Campbell) 651, withdrawn, 658

Western Canada. *See* Western Provinces

Western Canada Colonization Association. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Western Grain Standards Board. *See* Grain, Marketing

Western Provinces. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration; Natural Resources. For individual provinces. *See their respective titles*
Agricultural conditions, 1196, 1201, 1439, 1880, 1889, 2766. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Banks and Banking; Budget; Immigration; Railways; *and under this title,* Conditions
Examples of successes and failures, 2767
Questionnaire and answer, 2772
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, administration, 2132
Bad farming, 1889, 2781, 2812
Branch lines construction, 4185
Conditions in, 1213, 1221, 1246, 1347, 1349, 1352, 1388, 1396, 1398, 1402, 1415, 1854, 1883, 1890, 2747, 2811, 2845, 2961, 2977, 3002, 4038, 4062, 4222

Western Provinces—*Con.*
Conditions in—*Con.*
"Calamity howlers", 2811, 2977
Christison, Mr. J. N., 1891
Goosen, Mr. Peter, 1892
Spence, Mr. George, 1891
Winter trips to British Columbia and California, 1252
Extravagance, 1889
Farm mortgages, 2962
Farmers' earnings, 2813
Field crops, 2846
Financial distress, 1890
Freight rates, 3190
Grain shipments. *See* Freight Rates; Grain; Vancouver Harbour Bill
Grievances, 3056-62
Immigration. *See that title*
Industries, 1889
Lack of, 4047
Interest rates, 1088. *See also* Banks and Banking
Mixed farming, 2772
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Municipal and provincial extravagance in building, 1890
Natural resources, 1121, 2782, 2836, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Petroleum bounties, 2648
Redistribution, 4738
Remoteness from tidewater, 2962
Representation on Railway Commission, 3192
Ridicule and intimidation, 2813
Rural income tax-payers, 2845
Rural mail delivery, 1790
Rural shareholders of banks, 2846
Saline lake deposits, 3198
Secession talk, 2808, 2814, 2961, 2977, 3067
Settlement of due to railways, 2833
Solidarity, 3062
Surveys in, qu. 1866
Tariff and, 1424, 2747
Taxation, undue burden on, 2781. *See also* Taxation
Thornton, Sir Henry, statement, 2962
Transportation, 4222. *See also* Freight Rates; Grain
Treatment, 4191
Understanding with manufacturers, 3023
Unrest, alleged condition of, 4514
Wealth "stream drying up" 2757

Weyburn Security Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Interest on investment, 976

Wharves—*Con.*
New Brunswick, transfer to federal government, 946
Revenue, 976
United States, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wharfage tolls, 975

Wheat. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Stem Saw-Fly. *See* Agriculture; Insect Pests

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, 278

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Agricultural implements, standardization, 809
British preference, woollen goods, 3470
Budget, 2964. Debt and taxation; expenditure; retrenchment in civil government; raisins and dried currants; duty; Australia, trade with; French treaty; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty; binder twine, discrimination against manufacturer, 2964; history of binder twine industry; price advance following abolition of duty; production, imports and exports, 2965; home and export prices; tariff stability; knowledge as to conditions of investment; reciprocity proposals; amendment, 2966; income tax; unearned income; indemnity of members; socialistic doctrine; Abraham Lincoln on rights of capital, 2967
Firebrick duty, 3482
Fuel supply, 809
Old age annuities, 1639
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Penitentiaries, 771
Pensions, disability entitling to, 679
Post offices, grade 3, qu. 4300
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3781
Tobacco imports, duties, qu. 1258
Unemployment relief, 690
Welland canal construction, 3781

White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

White, Sir Thomas, Reciprocity, "Noble Eighteen", 2908

White Mud River, fishway, 3362

White Star Dominion Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Whitney, Sir James, hydro-electric development, 1267

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Combines Bill

Widows, Pensions. *See* Pensions

Wild Life Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations Bill

Wiley Estate. *See* Yukon

Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Willison, Sir John. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Canada Colonization Association, 1323, 1328, 1429
Retirement from, 1164
Reminiscences, quotation from, 1182

Wilson, Mr. G. C. (Wentworth)
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 624, 2492
Ontario projected highways, qu. 624

Windermere Highway. *See* Banff-Windermere

Windsor, N.S.
Dredging, 1010
Historic sites, 3406

Windsor, Ont., emigration, 1404

Wines. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Winnipeg
Coal purchases for public buildings, 496
Elmwood postal station, 4628
Emigration from, to United States, 1975
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Government printing, 3144
Winnipeg Saturday Post, qu. 3323
Grain sample market, qu. 345
Institutions and services of, 1214
Liberal Association, immigration, 1429
Lord Shaw, statement on immigration, 2833
Minto street armoury, qu. 2084
Proportional representation, 392, 411, 412, 433. *See also that title*
Stockyards, 2762
Ukrainians, resolution. *See* West Ukrainian Republic
Unemployment, 41-42, 435, 1124, 1215, 1644, 1883
Mayor, representations from, 1658

Winnipeg—*Con.*
Water powers, 3421, 3425. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Winnipeg Free Press, emigration, 2790

Winnipeg-St. Croix projected railway, 2898

Winnipeg River, 1214. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Wireless Telegraphy, 3337. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Telegraphs and Telephones
Hudson Bay route, 1046
Industrial Group, Great Britain, message from, 4436
Navigation and, 3333
Northwest territories, 3944-5
Vessels, equipment, 3355-6
Wireless stations, 3374
Mayo, 4702

Wolves. *See* Animals, Wild

Wolvin, Mr. Lee H., 4281. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Women
Civil Service, in, 1772
Dominion Council of Health, representation, 3649
Farm, 1844
Pensions, 1651. *See also that title*
Representation in parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Women's Labour League, 2718

Wood, Mr. E. R., 60

Wood, Mr. H. W., statement on budget, 2771, 2853, 2946

Wood, Mr. W. F., income tax conviction, qu. 3582

Wood. *See also* Lumber
Staves, duty, 3487

Woodbridge, Ont., postmaster, 1821, 1828

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Bacon, grading, 593
Budget, 2846. A dual policy, 2846; tariff; slow movement of Liberal party toward reduction; reciprocity; market for agricultural products; effect of United States emergency tariff on Canadian exports; cheque tax; limitation, inequitable, 2847; agricultural

Woods, Mr. R. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
implements, tariff; speech of Mr. Meighen session of 1910-1911, "ramparts of gold"; protection increased by rise in price, 2848; boots and shoes, duty on; Canadian manufacturers, monopoly of home market and free access to United States; agricultural conditions, home markets practically worthless to farmers; world competition in agricultural products, 2849; tariff for revenue; duties too high to produce revenue; cigarettes; industrial centralization; disappearance of small manufacturing establishments, 2850; manufacturers, beneficiaries of cheaper production; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberals who opposed reciprocity, the "Noble Eighteen"; Sir Thomas White; manufacturers support government that will protect them; class legislation; Progressive group out for equal rights; tariff joint product of Liberal and Conservative parties, 2851
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 740
Rural mail carriers, 1789
Seed inspection, 197
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Wines native, prohibition of manufacture, 2411
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Woods, Lake of. *See* Lake of the Woods

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 41. Omissions in speech from Throne; no lessening of burden of taxation; unemployment situation, 41; statements from organizations and municipalities, 41-42; immigration scheme; land settlement plan; past immigration policy, 43; financial condition; commercial treaties, 44; Near East crisis; Canada's national status; Mr. J. A. Hobson on imperialism, 45; British policy in foreign affairs; Lloyd George; ex-Premier Nitti of Italy, 46; Trades Union Congress at the Hague, 46-47; necessity for permanent peace, 47
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Annual drill, 866, 4636
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 994,999
Autonomy, Canadian, 45, 4651

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4018, 4084-87, 4144-61
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Lawful association, amdt. 4084, neg. 4085
Officials, right of organization, amdt.. 4161, neg. 4161
Shareholders' audit, amdt. 4087, neg. 4090
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Belle River harbour, 4608
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British and foreign news service, 4712
Budget, 2718; amendment, Mr. Forke; free trade; greater economy in public administration; social readjustment; perpetuation of National Policy; tariff on implements of production, 2718; Liberal party promises forgotten; taxation of necessaries of life; raisins; Women's Labour League, telegram, 2718; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, statement; legislative and administrative machinery; over-organization; economic resources; estimated wealth of Canada, 2719; natural resources; gold, one per cent of national wealth; annual production; manufacturing industries, production costs and profit; capital invested; provincial and municipal debts, 2720; per capita debt; unemployment, anxiety and general dissatisfaction; labour, viewpoint of; doctrine of free trade; industrial and economic changes; free trade England; unemployment and social difficulties; labour and socialism; British National Labour party, policy, 2721; suppression of capitalistic system; resolution introduced in British House of Commons; Lloyd George and British socialism; H. G. Wells, sinking of ship of civilization; Dr. J. J. Tompkins of St. Francis Xavier University, Catholic social principles, 2722; face to face with serious crisis; industrial revolution; individualistic production; the farmer; transportation systems; internationalism, 2723; thinking in terms of the parish rather than of the world; status of the worker; freedom and the introduction of the taxing system; agricultural and industrial workers; concentration of capital; John Maynard Keynes, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace"; markets, 2724; buying power; war, causes of; combinations and trusts;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
financial control; monopoly of credits; economic and social consequences of capitalism; control of educational agencies, 2725; Upton Sinclair, Capitalistic Control of the Press; control of government; federation of British industries; Canadian Manufacturers' Association; Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Decay of Capital and Civilization; wealth and poverty; privileges and monopolies, 2726; wage slavery; serious economic conditions; industrial democracy; socialism and state socialism; railways; spheres of federal and provincial control; coal mines; production for the use and not for profit, 2727; financial systems; labour platform; natural resources; public ownership and operation of public utilities and large scale industries; nationalization of banking system; abolition of class privilege; capital levy for war debt; taxation inequalities; History of Canadian Wealth; private property; natural resources; ownership and taxation of, 2728; conscription of men and wealth; new epoch in history; Rabindranath Tagore on civilization; radical changes necessary, 2729
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Supply, relevancy, 4602
Canada Gazette, 1709
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada-West Indies
Steamship service, 3378
Treaty, 3379
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3844
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3384
Vessels, sale of, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Board, labour representation, 3636
Coal, Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027
Management, responsibility and powers, 3635, 3699
Paris offices, 3699
Shopmen, resolution, 1338
Capital levy, 2728, 2909
Capital for settlers, 1039
China, civilization of, 2486

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration bill, 2338, 2485
Children, 2484
Merchants, 2484
Wives, 2484
Civil Service
Bonus, employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Salary revision, 1793-4
Underpaid, 4672
Combines
Coal situation, 254
Legislation inquiry, 254
Combines bill, 2551
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 2282
Sedition, 616
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2389
Doukhobors, 1340
Eight-hour day, 1643
English and French-speaking people harmony, 1341
External Affairs department, 3588
False Creek bridge, 4708
Farm labourers Winnipeg, 1976
Farm lands, prices, 1087
Freight rates on coal, 1345
Fuel supply, exploitation, 1344
German reparations, M. 280, 311
Governor General
Cars, repairs, 4691
Expenditure, 4627
Hansard, distribution of, 1715
Hector celebration, 4636, 4706
Hemp bounty bill, 4377, 4380
Hindu franchise, 4650-1
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Restaurant, 2692
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2347, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3155
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1336, 3637
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Child, 1342
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Exclusion, 2485
Students, 2485
Naturalization, 2196
Policy, 1336
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2433
Deportation without trial, 2433
Imperial Conference, 4650
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 3453

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Imperial Economic Conference, agenda, 3453
Imperial federation, 4651
International Labour Conference, 1643
Joint control of industry, 1655
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1704-6
Control, etc, 1655
Delegates from United States detention. *See under this title,* Howat
Estimates, reasons for decrease, 1638
Immigration and, 1339
Industrial councils, 1654
Industrial disputes, public utilities, 1703
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Organizations, federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2892
Right to organize, 2891
Bank officers and employees, 4084, 4161
Penitentiaries and, 772
Representation in parliament, 397, 3555
Strikes and unemployment, 1631
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4176
Land policy, 1344
Land tax, 1344
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1212, 1309
Lausanne Conference, 54
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
League of Nations, 3993
Library of Parliament, 2693
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 844
Mennonites, 1341
Meyerscough, Thomas, detention at border. *See under this title,* Howat
Military expenditure, 866
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2686
National Policy, permanency, 4652
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2195, 2455-57
Naturalization, Mounted Police and, 779
Nova Scotia steel workers, strike, 1643
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3871
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3716
Old age, inquiry, 733, 1646
Royal commission, interim report, 2167
Post office employees, salaries, 1794
Powell River Paper Company, 2891
Printing bureau employees, 1623
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 396, 419
Railway electrification, 3425
Rideau hall expenditure, 4627
Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duties, seven-day week, 4514
M. for disbandment, 816, 1139, 1151
Naturalization, and, 779
Reorganization, 776
Rural credits, 4146
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Russia, relations with, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986
Saar Valley Commission, 4652
Settlers' relief, 3448
Singapore naval base, 2469
Sydney steel strike, 287, 1643
Taxation, excessive, 1345
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Trial by jury, 2433
Ukrainians, 1341
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Labour
Insurance, 1638
Provision for, qu. 732
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Relief, foreigners, 1883
Value of time lost, 1685
Winnipeg, 1124-5, 1644
Conference on, 1659
Union label on Labour Gazette, 1623
United States industries and Canada, 4380
Vickers, qu. 2205
War, glorification of, 2686
Water powers
Lake the Woods, 3425
Policy, 3424
Publicity, 3421
Public and private ownership, 3425
Winnipeg, 3421
Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145
Winnipeg, Minto street armoury, qu. 2084

Wool, 2866. *See also* Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Live Stock; Textiles
Bounty on, 2866
Duty on, 447, 2866
Imports, qu. 617
Raw wool, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Sales tax, 2742
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973, 2823, 2827, 2866
Trenton mill, 3461

Woollen Industry. *See* Textiles

Workmen. *See* Labour

World's Moral Ideas, International conference, 1205

Wrangel Island, ownership, 3360, 3948

Wrecking Plants, Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763

Wrecks. *See* Marine; Vessels

Writers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Yarmouth, N.S., dredging, 944, 1011

York, Duke and Duchess, Congratulations on wedding, 2251, 2338

Yorkton Income tax office, qu. 384

Yorkton Enterprise, emigration to United States, 1404

Young, Arthur and Company. *See* Civil Service

Yukon Territory
Administration
Congdon, Mr. F. T., qu. 3131
Correspondence, 2299
Justice, 705
Road construction, 3943
British Empire exhibition, mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Council, 3943
Indemnity, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516

Yukon Territory—*Con.*
Extent of, 87
Gold output, 88
Governor General, visit of, 85
History, 85-89
Klondike, 86
Mineral resources, 85-86
Mining fees, 1636
Quartz-mining, 249
Naturalization, 2459
Population, 3943
Telegraph system, qu. 1662, qu. 2417, 2683, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Trial of Eskimos. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Wiley estate, administration, qu. 3131

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill
(Right to appeal from interlocutory judgement; jury trial; mining claims, property or location)
1r., 767-8; 2r., 4247; com., 4247; 3r., 4248

Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Zavitz, Dr., introduction of Mandeschuri barley, 483

Zinc. *See* Treaties, French Treaty